
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th March, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. A. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting held on 13th February, 1962, have been corrected and re-circulated, and if there is no objection, those Minutes will be confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes of the meeting of 13th February, 1962, are hereby confirmed.

Also circulated have been the Minutes of the meeting of 20th February, 1962. If there is no objection, those Minutes will be confirmed.

There being apparently no objection, those Minutes are also confirmed.

I have received a copy of the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th November, 1961.

Likewise, I have received certain amendments from the Other Place to the Pensions (Amendment) Bill.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Message No. 1/1962 forwarding the draft Estimates of Current Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1962-63.

Message No. 2/1962 forwarding the draft Estimates of Capital Expenditure for the financial year 1962-63.

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise receipts for the seven months ended the 31st October, 1961.

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise receipts for the eight months ended the 30th November, 1961.

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly indicators — August, 1961.

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly indicators — September, 1961.

PETITION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Petition of Eric John Murray on behalf of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$59,185 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62 Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62, No. 44, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,340,351 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure to be incurred during the Financial year 1962-63 on Capital Works included in the Estimates 1962-63, Part II, Capital.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March, 1963.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the people of St. Thomas are without the service of public telephones and in view of the fact that such is a dire necessity,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government immediately undertake to instal at least two public telephone services in the said parish, one at Welchman Hall, and one at Hillaby.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the Fishermen at Bathsheba in the parish of St. Joseph in this Island are deeply perturbed through the treatment meted out to them by the Fisheries' Officer if, and when his assistance is needed, and more particularly his indifference to their complaint on Thursday the first of March, 1962 when about ten (10) boats were damaged as a result of rough seas in the area;

AND WHEREAS it seems very unlikely that there will ever be any confidence by the Fishermen in the said Officer;

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly in view of the importance of the Fishing Industry to the life of the Community, coupled with the fact that Public Funds are tied up in this Industry, order an immediate investigation into the said Industry with special reference to the relationship between the Fishermen and the said Fisheries' Officer?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly view with alarm and disgust the decision of the Federal Legislature to pay gratuities to Ministers and Members of the Federal Legislature consequent upon the dissolution of the West Indian Federation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BOXILL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government make representation to the Bridgetown City Council requesting the said Council to instal street lights along the Government road leading from the Aquatic Club to the Isolation Ward at Gravesend Beach?

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

Is Government aware that the entire community is greatly concerned as to the danger of its health, in particular a predisposition to cancer in the lung, caused by fumes emanating from the exhausts of diesel-run buses and trucks operated both by Government and by private concessionaires?

2. If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, will the Minister immediately take steps to obviate this health hazard by having the mechanical construction of these buses changed that the exhaust fumes shall be discharged from a pipe jutting into the air above the buses, thereby ceasing to pollute the atmosphere?

Mr. LYNCH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Does Government agree that in view of constitutional developments in this Island, members of the General Assembly should cease to be referred to as "Member of Colonial Parliament" (M.C.P.)?

2. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative what action will Government take to put an end to the practice?

3. Will Government direct that members of the General Assembly be designated "Member of the House of Assembly" (M.H.A.)?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is correct for the hon. member to ask a question like that of the Government. As Your Honour will

remember, at the beginning of the Session, there was some correspondence between Your Honour and myself concerning the designation of members of this Chamber because we feel it is a matter which peculiarly falls within the province of the Speaker of the House itself.

I know that Your Honour has done some research on the matter and has certain views which at the proper time you will disclose to the House. Really, Sir, I do not think those questions should be allowed because I am not competent to answer them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad the hon. junior member for the City brought the matter to the attention of the House and I do not rule the question out of order, because it is very tactfully asked, the first part reading thus:

"Does Government agree that in view of the constitutional development, etc.,"

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that a female Civil Servant employed with the Department of Highways and Transport has been dismissed on the 28th February, 1962, without being given an opportunity to state her case?

2. Would the Minister initiate immediate steps to investigate the circumstances with the intention of remedying the situation to protect female and other employees working with the said Department, and that the said employee be allowed to give evidence?

3. Would the Minister also enquire into the administration of the said Department, as many other employees are working with similar fear of dismissal?

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

Is the Minister aware that quite a few people who from fifteen to thirty years ago have been living on Clifton Tenantry in the parish of St. Thomas have been given notice to quit by 31st March, 1962?

2. Will Government therefore initiate immediate negotiations with the owners of the said tenantry with a view to purchasing same in order that the said people's houses may remain sited on such lands?

3. Will Government in the alternative acquire another site - preferably at Walkes Spring, St. Thomas, which is about 200 yards away from the said tenantry - for the resiting of the said tenants?

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 unsatisfactory?

3. If the answer to the 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?

Mr. COWARD: 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?

12.30 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the services of the island for the year ending on the 31st March, 1963, be now read a first time.

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

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891, be now read a first time.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, be now read a first time.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

STATEMENT *re* SECURITY OF PERSONS
AND PROPERTY IN BARBADOS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before we begin the Orders of the Day, I should like to make this Statement on behalf of the Government of Barbados. As you know, Sir, our people in the Northern countries, in the highly industrialised, educated societies in the Northern Hemisphere, often display a complete ignorance as to the geography and politics of the Caribbean region. I have recently had the experience of receiving from a person who is head of a great industrial combine, I believe, who is also a member of the House of Lords, a communication informing me that he intended to be at a well known hotel in Kingston, Jamaica, on a certain date in March and that he would be pleased to call at my office and see me during his stay at his hotel in Jamaica. I have mentioned that because it is very important to persons who live outside the Caribbean area and who, from a deficiency either in the system of education or the organs for the dissemination of information in the countries in which they live, have misconceptions about the politics and the geography of the West Indies; and when events occur in certain parts which are remote both politically and geographically from Barbados they are apt to ascribe to the region as a whole a certain amount of political and economic instability. This is not discouraged by statements made from time to time by West Indians who should know better and who can only be regarded as traitors to their own country when they try to sabotage the efforts of the people to uplift themselves and to achieve a higher standard of living and take their rightful position amongst the comity of nations. It would be invidious for me to mention any names at this stage.

Mr. Speaker, the Statement which I am called upon to make on behalf of this island is as follows: "The Government of Barbados wishes to re-affirm its policy and guarantee to all citizens, visitors and investors in this island the security of person and property. Funds in this island are freely convertible under the Currency Act, 1959 Chapter 22 and will so continue."

The policy of this Government is to encourage investment in the island by incentives and not by restrictions. (Hear! Hear!)

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Indus-

try and Labour:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62 No. 43

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$15,974 under Head XXIX of the Estimates - Miscellaneous Services. The Items are all set out there, I do not think that I can usefully add anything to the notes of this Resolution, but I shall be very willing to answer any questions which hon. members may like to ask. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier has said that he did not think he could usefully add anything to the Addendum to this Resolution. The note to Item 73, "Agricultural Census", says that the amount of \$14,500 to cover the cost of an Agricultural Census in Barbados has proved inadequate mainly because it was found necessary to increase the rates of remuneration and travelling paid to the enumerators employed in this exercise and supplementary provision of \$3,500 is now being sought. I should like to know what was the amount of travelling paid before and what was the rate of remuneration. Merely to say in the note that it was found necessary to increase the rates of remuneration and travelling paid to the enumerators is not good enough because we do not know what was the remuneration or the travelling. I hope the Hon. Premier will be able to tell us that.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, whilst the Hon. Premier is looking for the information, as we are dealing with one Head, I am going to deal with all the Items under this Head. Under the first note dealing with Agricultural Census, I think that it should be drawn to the Government's attention that the age old practice of having sugar canes planted alongside the streets when we had the old horse and buggy days has become a hazardous situation, and at this time of the year when you have motor traffic multiplying in this Island, that practice should be completely eliminated. A law should be passed making it obligatory for plantations to plant canes so many feet away from the Highway. It is impossible in some instances for people to see road signs. Some road signs indicating that there is a major road are completely hidden by canes, and strangers coming to the Island, not seeing them, drive through those major roads without having any idea that they are there. You see a marked difference now that the first rows have been cut, and you then realise what an advantage it would have been to travelling in this Island if that had been done, so far as eliminating a positive danger is concerned. Planting canes in that way 100 or 200 years ago with the slow moving traffic of a cow and a horse was of such that accidents were kept at a minimum; but there is very little point in asking for buildings to go back when the whole Island is being obscured by sugar cane growing right on the side of the street.

I think it would be a good thing for the Government to investigate, and I do not think it would be a terrible loss to the sugar industry, because the amount that would have to go back, taken as a whole, would be negligible as compared with safety which is very important.

The other matter to which I would like to draw attention is Item 77 - Central Government Elections. It is stated here in the note that the amount provided in the current Es-

timates to meet the expenses of the 1961 Central Government Elections has proved inadequate, because extensive repairs had to be effected to the polling booths, which had been attacked by termites and because it was necessary, as a result of this shift of population from one area to another, especially in respect of Government Housing areas, to divide several polling stations into two or three sections with a consequent increase in the number of presiding officers and poll clerks originally estimated for.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend that my suggestion is going to make it cheaper. It may initially make it more expensive; but if a country is a Democratic country and believes in elections, then the machinery for elections should be of such a capital nature that it should last for as long as possible. We must see that this is an age in which we can get material of a more durable character and made up in such a way that it is easy to move — some collapsible stuff which can be stored easily so that we would not have this unnecessary expense in having booths that are made out of wood which are put in places and are bound to be attacked by termites, because I do not believe there is any proper storage place for these things where they can be looked after, and every five years — and in some instances three years — unless you have a bye-election, it is very difficult to have these booths free from termites.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that they investigate methods of using more durable material, some sort of metal with a small metal-topped desk — you do not need big desks — and have them so built that they can be stored quite easily; and maybe for practical purposes the partitions to separate the people can be of a similar nature, and you may find uses for them in some of your offices. I think the capital cost would be worthwhile, and you would not have this recurrent expense.

I think I should take this opportunity to draw to Government's attention that if it is their intention to have three-year elections, and if elections are going to take place in Barbados in 1964, there is no point at this stage of not having preparation made quite early. Now I have been in this House long enough to know that, with this problem of having elections, the reason for this expense which we are now having is that the past Government were in a hurry when they had adult suffrage, and waited until the last moment, and you find that in Barbados the boundaries are by roadways and have absolutely nothing to do with the population. As an example: lots of people would know that if you take certain parts of the City, it looks easy. For instance, you go up Baxters Road and up Passage Road, then turn down White Park, keep to your right and go back down King Street. Now I have a classic example in my own constituency where people have to wend their way from Sedge Pond, Lonesome Hill, Roebuck, Prospect, Indian Ground, Rose Hill and such districts to vote at All Saints, going into Mile-and-a-Quarter, when you could easily have a polling station in Indian Ground itself which would accommodate these people.

Mr. Chairman, you have this nonsense at elections and you have the other tragedy of people who are living in Mile-and-a-Quarter and Rose Hill having to leave there and go, not to All Saints, but to the Coleridge and Parry School down by District "E" Station. Then you have the other spectacle of people living in Road View having to leave Road View and go, not to the Alexandra School, but to the Coleridge and Parry School to vote. It is easy for the Government to come down here and get money, but it is not easy for those of us who run to come here and get money, and it imposes an unnecessary expenditure on candidates who are not relieved of taxation, because income tax is not allowable for the expenses you have at election time. I feel the time has come when this Island should make voting so easy for the population that it is not incumbent on candidates that they must of necessity provide transport for people in order to get them to the polls. It is a situation today to which we look forward, so with three years coming up, I would like to say that it is time we should appoint a Boundaries Commission; and in this House a Bill has already been passed making it possible for lower age groups which would increase the voting population, and in the Government's manifesto it is stated that they are in favour of single member constituencies.

12.50 p.m.

I feel that if those tasks have to be performed at this moment, say in March, 1962, the machinery for going into all of the aspects should be properly geared so that when 1964 comes, the electoral roll would have been made and the amendment to the Representation of the Peoples' Act would be done that all of the machinery would be in order. I say that because we really do want to put in proper gear all of these aspects so that Barbadians can get on the electoral roll for voting purposes as easily as possible. As it is now, the people who were 21 years at the time of the last elections would have to wait for nine months before they can exercise their right to vote. Those people cannot vote until July; and if a bye-election comes along now, although for three months previous to that they were eligible to vote, they cannot exercise their right to do so until July. Those things are wrong and the Government should look into them and set the machinery into action for dealing with them, so that instead of the mad scramble which you get when it comes to the end, it should be dealt with now.

As regards Item 83(new) - United Nations Technical Assistance: Local Costs - the note reads as follows:-

"The assessed local cost of experts supplied under the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme in respect of 1962 is \$9,273.50."

Where is this technical assistance for?

The note goes on to state:

"This amount which is due to be paid in advance, is based on the application of a common percentage figure (12 1/2%) to the total cost of expert services provided."

I repeat, where is this for and for whom? Is this for the whole world, the Western Hemisphere, or is it for Tobago, or Trinidad?

We have some idea of the technical assistance programme supplied by United Nations. United Nations have supplied technical assistance for Europe like that in the Marshall Plan. That is why I was thinking in terms of this money being \$9 million instead of \$9,000, because the note does not indicate whether this money is wanted for the Western Hemisphere, the Caribbean area or the West Indies.

On the other hand, I would like to say that there is room for an economic adviser for training within industry. I do hope, when it comes to the idea for training within industry, that the Government would realise that although Government service is not regarded as an industry, Government Departments should be something for training within industries. The reason why I say that is because I am satisfied within my mind that Government Departments of Barbados are places where you have lots of people tumbling on top of one another particularly those in high offices; therefore, we can surely do with a little investigation.

I think that an economic adviser is a person whom Barbados really stands in need of and I hope that when the time comes we will have the full benefit of these experts. As a matter of fact, I think it would be well if we could get some more of these experts.

Those are the remarks which I have to make. As regards them, some are my own comments and some need a reply from the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for the City wanted to know about the rates and the travelling paid to the enumerators. I think he meant those who carried out the agricultural census.

There were six enumerators and they were paid \$117 each. The amount was made up as follows: period of training \$20, travelling \$60 and for the actual enumerating \$37.

An increase of \$40 was given afterwards which brought the amount to \$157 which was then made up as follows: period of training \$20, travelling \$75, and for the actual enumerating \$62. Therefore, there was an increase of \$15 on travelling and \$25 on that for the actual enumerating.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXIX....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Hon. Premier is unaware that questions were asked by me,

one of which needs an answer. It is very impolite of him. If the Hon. Premier wants the co-operation of the House, he must set a better example in dealing with parliamentary matters.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not heard the question. Repeat it.

Mr. WALCOTT: You heard it. You know that I asked a question and I will not repeat it. The hon. member knows what the question is. This stupidity is not going to last too long. This is no dictatorship.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I told the hon. member that I did not hear him putting any question. I heard the hon. senior member for the City ask a question, which was a very short question. The hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke at length and a question may be in what he said. Up to now, I do not know really the full context in which the hon. member was speaking because I was not listening. There is no point in the hon. member flying off like that. Why did he not ask a direct question like the hon. senior member for the City?

I merely asked the hon. senior member for St. Peter to tell me what the question is and I would be glad to answer it. For him to assume and put worse motives on what I have said, particularly in view of the fact that at the opening of each legislative session the Speaker asks that the best motives be placed on hon. member's speeches, is not right. Now, we find the hon. member breaking this rule all the time. I have nothing to hide.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. Peter desirous of asking the question now?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I must say that I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter in one way and I disagree with him in another way on the question which he asked. The suggestion was made as to whether the Government was prepared to make recommendations as regards planting material in certain fields. I would say here and now that I do believe that, while the Hon. Premier was looking up the answer to my question, that was the time when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was putting forward his question. As regards his question, I believe the time has come when the Town and Country Planner should have some say in telling planters whether they should plant canes in fields which are at the corners of public highways because of the type of traffic which you use to take the produce to the factory. I cannot agree with him that you should say that throughout the entire Island you must not plant canes. I hope I am not misquoting him. I do not quite agree with him when he says that.

1.00 p.m.

I entirely agree with the hon. member there, but to say that throughout the entire island you must not plant canes in this way — I hope I am not misquoting the hon. member — I do not think I could agree with him there at all. The hon. member said that he did not think it would interfere with the economy of the island if you did agree to prohibit the planting of canes along all the highways in the agricultural area. I partly disagree with the hon. member there, but I do agree with him that some authority should have the right to say that where the fields are around blind corners you should not be allowed to plant canes at these corners. It is true that the traffic which moves canes today is quite different from what it was in former days. If you were to go back, say, two cane holes throughout the island, that would substantially be felt in the economy of the island; but I agree that, with regard to these corners, somebody should have the authority mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: For the benefit of the hon. member I would like to say this. The hon. member will agree that the production of sugar in Barbados on a smaller area of land is multiplied one hundred-fold, and therefore the question of what you would lose by going back is only an amount to justify your mind. You do not take all the canes from the high-

way but how much you can take is the determining factor. You will lose something by going back, but Barbados is the only place where canes are grown in the way in which they are grown here. This is the only part of the world in which anything takes place right on the highway, anyhow. In the matter of buildings, guardwalls and the growing of canes, Barbados is unique in that sense. We grow canes each year: and as to this question of growing canes along the highway, I may say that along some highways canes are not planted owing to the rotation of the fields. Today, in Barbados, when it comes to sugar cane, we will find ourselves in any case faced with the fact that there will be a point where it will not be worthwhile planting any more than a certain amount of sugar cane in view of the price which you will get for sugar. I will tell the hon. member that there are instances now in which canes actually meet in some places and they have to tie them back from the highway so as to alleviate danger. The traffic has multiplied in this island by leaps and bounds and you have to do something to make people travel more comfortably. I find great difficulty in going through the country during the day and it is made quite difficult for travelling with these canes overhanging the highway. When you have a census that is the sort of information which you will have.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to bandy words with the hon. member, but Barbados is still 166 square miles in area with 240,000 people. I agree with you in all that you are planning to have; and to make the point that Barbados is quite unique, I say it is unique in the density of population and that prevents us from doing what Jamaica and Trinidad would do when it comes to the question of land.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

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

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

CUSTOMS BILL

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill attempts to present in compact form three existing Acts in this country dealing with Customs. The first is the Customs Establishment Act, 1905; the second is the Trade Act, 1910, and the third is the Customs Tariff Act, 1921. In order to do this, we are actually repealing those three existing Acts.

1.10 p.m.

Now hon. members will note that the First, Second and Third Schedule of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, appear again in this Bill, and this is because of the negotiations which were taking place between the Units of the Federation with respect to a Customs Union. Parts One, Two and Three of the First Schedule will therefore leave as they are all the existing laws providing for customs dues additional to those prescribed under the Customs Tariff Act, 1921. The Bill itself is based on the McLaghlan Report of 1948 which was adopted by all the West Indian territories including British Guiana.

Now attached to the Bill is an index which outlines in brief all the several special matters which really fall within the scope of the Bill with the definitions in Parts One and Two, and the Third Chapter — Customs Tariff — contains provisions of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, Part Three brings together the provisions of the Customs Laws which deal with the importation and exportation of goods. Then there are other miscellaneous matters dealt with in Part XI of the Bill, and in view of what I have said originally about the First, Second and Third Schedules of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, the additional provisions have been inserted in order to keep alive for the time being all the subsidiary legislation made under the three Acts which this one repeals. If there is any more information hon. members want in this matter, I would be glad to give it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clause 16 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be no desire up to now to contest any sections of this Bill, and I would suggest to the Committee that, rather than waste time, we report progress and go back to the House so that we can ask the Speaker's permission to deal with all the Sections from Section 15 to the end at one time; so if hon. members so desire and there are no intentions of contesting any of the Sections of the Bill, I am going to suggest that the Committee report progress at this stage so that we can go back to the House again and get permission to deal with this Bill one time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like, before hon. members fly off the handle, to say that there are certain procedures in Parliamentary Institutions, and in my opinion, this is a waste of time. There are, I believe, about 263 Sections in this Bill, and you can see that we can take from now until tonight. The normal procedure is that the Bill can be read in parts in Committee or alternatively it can be read as a whole or from Section so-and-so; but in order to ensure that the Democratic process is not infringed upon, I think the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Minister of Trade, is the correct one, because he is giving an opportunity for any member who has any objections or any statements or submissions or suggestions to make to any part of the Bill, and this is where I may have to depart from him on a matter of Parliamentary procedure not to report back to the House, but allow members to do it now in Committee, and move that from Section 15 to Section 263 stand part of the Bill.

1.20 p.m.

If, say, you move that from 248 to Clause 263 stand part of the Bill, and Clause 255 is in dispute, we can move from that particular Clause, that is to say, we can hold it over and deal with the others. If hon. members have read this Bill, as I presume they have, they would know exactly what sections they deem controversial or what sections they want to make suggestions on.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is not the first Bill which was brought to this Chamber containing so many sections. We have passed Bills in here like this, containing over 250 clauses. I am glad the Hon. Premier said that it is

not dictatorial, but the very actions of the Premier today show the inroad that they are making and show that if you give certain people too much authority that it gets to their heads. What does he mean by saying that when it is public business being done? Where are you going? Where is this hurry? He talks of it being done in other Parliaments. Let me ask him which Parliament? Is it Cuba he is talking about? Dr. Castro may pass something like that in that manner. What have we come here to do? We have come here to do public business. I resent people saying that we are wasting time. How can you be wasting time when you are passing a Bill? The Hon. Minister is saying that if we pass it clause by clause, we are wasting time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member did not hear what I said. I asked the Committee to indicate if they were any sections of the Bill which they desired to have discussed. I did not say that we should do something. I said that if they did not want to then we would not do it. The hon. member must remember this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. The hon. member is now making a speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not making a speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister said that this is wasting time. I say that this is not wasting time if they bring down a Bill and we have to consider it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is giving the impression that the Government wants to stifle debate on this matter. That is not true.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not say so. The hon. member said that this is wasting time and I said, "how can you accuse us of wasting time when this is your Bill?"

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, when the House had the chance of objecting to the principle of the Bill, nobody said a word. The time for raising objections was when the Bill was before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Are you suggesting to us that you have to raise objections to a Bill so as to consider it clause by clause? Are we idiots in here?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House has not yet developed his point.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot develop a point on a point of order. He has risen on a point of order.

Sir, do you know what I object to? I object to these subtleties and their wanting to do these things quickly. Today is a meeting of the House of Assembly and this Bill is the biggest thing on the Order Paper. We have listened to the Hon. Minister and he has said that we should deal with this Bill section by section. The next thing that they will come down here and say is that after you have given the second reading to a Bill, you should not worry to go into Committee on it at all. The Hon. Premier talks about what is done in other Parliaments. Whom are you talking to? Do you think that you are talking to somebody down Bawdens? We can debate this Bill clause by clause. He says that you should debate it section by section and there is the suggestion that we are wasting time. (A VOICE: Who said so?) They said so.

They have brought this Bill down. Already they have passed ten clauses and they are saying that the pace is too slow for them. The Hon. Premier talks about democracy. When we dealt with a Bill like this, which was the Representation of the Peoples Act, we were given the opportunity to go through it clause by clause. Now, they are asking us to pass a similar lengthy Bill section by section and you get this suggesting of wasting time. Whose time are you wasting? We are not wasting anybody's time. We are paid to come in here. I see all the symptoms of dictatorship exemplified today and somebody has to put his feet down on it. Dictatorship Governments come down as fast as they go up.

This seat which I am holding in this Honourable Chamber, I am not holding it on the good wishes of anybody. Therefore, anybody who wants to challenge me has to challenge me there because I am holding this seat through the vote of the people in my constituency.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, when I first came in here, no matter how lengthy a Bill was, the Clerk had to read it word for word. He had to read every word in every section or in every clause. It was pointed out to us then — I think it was by the last Government — that members having had their Bills previously and gone through them would have made their notes; therefore, the reading of the Bill section by section or clause by clause in Committee was not necessary, and it was further stated that that was not the practice in England. I was told that the Appropriation Bill in England was actually passed *en bloc*. We actually pass our Appropriation Bill *en bloc* too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: From the time I was in here the Appropriation Bill was always passed *en bloc*. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is getting on as if what we are suggesting is a new departure. What we are now considering is consolidating the Customs Act which was on the Statute Book for the last 59 years. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of the last Government, they used to pass the Appropriation Bill *en bloc*.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier had just said "when I was a member of the last Government." The question of passing the Appropriation Bill *en bloc* was something which was done after the Government had achieved ministerial status. They said that you had passed the Estimates, the passing of the Appropriation Bill was only a matter of course. That was the practice after ministerial status came into operation. If the hon. member wants to stretch it further than that, my memory is too good to allow him to get away with it.

Now, Sir, this is not passing an Appropriation Bill; this is passing a Customs Act.
1.30 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to suggest to the Minister to go on now in the usual manner, calling Section 16 or Clause 16 and let us see what note we have to make on it. It is not a question of wasting time at all; if there was anybody who was opposed to the principle of the Bill, certainly he would have said so during the second reading. It is just a question of going on in the usual manner and agreeing to a motion that such-and-such a Clause stand part of the Bill. I see this danger; we are not all trained in the legal way of parliamentarians as the Hon. Premier or even as the Ministers, and therefore when the hon. introducer of the Bill moves that such-and-such a Section stand part of the Bill, we may then be able to spot something which we did not see before. I certainly cannot support the idea that we should say that we said nothing against the principle of the Bill during the second reading and therefore we should pass it just as we would pass the Appropriation Bill. I do not know what is the practice in other Parliaments, but I understand from other parliamentarians and legally-trained men that this is not the practice.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I should like the hon. member to name the parliamentarians and the legally-trained people who told him that is not the practice, and also to name the Parliaments in which it is not so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has had a tremendous influence over a lot of us with his experience and ability. I should like to say that this is the first time that I have ever heard him raise the question that this Bill should be dealt with in such a manner. When the Hon. Premier was outside the Government it was never raised by him; I could not support the idea of allowing the Chairman to report progress and then decide to pass the Bill. All of us are not as quick as some of us; I have on several occasions made notes and I am throwing out my suggestions in the best interest.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I have never said that we should report progress and pass the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No! No! I said that you should report progress and ask permission to pass the Bill in that way. I do not feel that it should be done in that way. My point is that I am still in the Opposition. The Premier is in the Government today; there was a time when he was not in the Government, and there was a time when he influenced a lot of us when he said that such-and-such a thing was not done in such-and-such a way. I suggest to the Minister that he should not put the matter in this way. When we get to Section 52 of this Bill, there may be something there which we did not have the time to scan, and the Minister himself knows that the reason why he did not get any opposition to the Bill is because there is a consolidation of the Acts. There was no point in offering any objection. If anybody had started to make a speech on this Bill, I would have called it wasting time. Just to report progress and ask permission to pass the Bill, I do not agree with that. (ASIDES) I am not begging for anything; I can take care of myself on a platform as well as anybody else. I repeat: I am not begging; I used to appeal to the Ministers over there and when they did not hear me I would curse them. I am among the last persons in this House who will have to beg. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are begging.) You are half an idiot all the same.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am addressing the Chair, but I do not mean that to the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this matter. I agree with the consolidation of these Acts; however, I am a bit uneasy. I remember some years ago when it was attempted in the days of Sir Grantley Adams to do this sort of thing. You cannot be expected to read every section of a long Bill. The Hon. Leader of the House is asking that we report progress and come back to the House and decide that we should pass this Bill, that we should go from Section 15 to Section 260. Imagine putting that sort of thing to the vote! What are you doing with Parliament? Are you going to force it through because you have 14 or possibly 15 seats in the House? If we are going to do things in that way, then we need not come to the House at all.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I think it is time to stop all this nonsense. What the hon. member is saying is tantamount to our trying to railroad the Bill through the House. I said that since the second reading of the Bill was passed completely unopposed, unless there was a desire on the part of any hon. member to raise any point at the Committee stage, I was asking for permission to do so-and-so. If any hon. member under Section 50, Section 60, Section 80 or Section 100 wanted to raise any question, that would have been an end of the matter. I never said that such a thing should be done.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for the hon. member to repeat the remarks which he has made. What did he have in mind when he suggested that we should report progress and ask the House to decide that the whole volume from Section 15 to Section 263 be taken as read? You are thinking of the Jet age; railroading is too slow.
1.40 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I first asked for an indication from the Committee as to whether or not hon. members intended raising any point or questioning any point during the debate. That is the first thing I did.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know, Sir, that it is necessary for the hon. member to say that. Is he hoping to scramble out of it through the usage of language, to pretend it was not his intention to play up the things operating in his mind at the moment, and then later on you pass legislation on that side of the House by telephone? What are you reducing Parliament to? Just force of numbers? Is this a type of dictatorship? I remember the Public Health Bill in which you got out of breath in here with the numbers out of sheer exhaustion hoping to get that Bill through, but we were restricted to the numbers and that is what one should expect

from a member that is elected by this country and given a mandate to run it. You must have a sense of responsibility, but I think you are toying with the fundamental principles of Parliament. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when I did not think we were doing right that the Clerk should read every single word. Can you imagine the difficulty of the Clerk searching for a glass of water by the time he reaches half way through? I am familiar with every single word of this Bill, because we have discussed it at Cabinet and there is nothing new in it, and I do not think it necessary to say something in Parliament when we were so familiar with it; but you are asking to take Section 15 because we are running easy, and because there are no comments or objections, you decide you are going to abandon the old steam railroad and use the jet period of probably 1,000 miles an hour and finish Clauses 15 to 263 in one decision because you have plurality votes in Parliament.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, we are very often treated to statements made by the members of the Legislature, especially if there is some visiting dignitary from the metropolitan country, about the Mother of Parliaments and the preservation of Parliamentary democracy in the Mother of Parliament. I am not urging that this Bill be put through the process I am advocating in view of the sentiments expressed since the hon. senior member for St. Philip made the suggestion that if there was no point of dispute, perhaps we should move on. We are living in the jet age after all, and if any member of this House has no disagreement with a single part of the Bill which is merely a consolidating Bill, I would say that talking about the Mother of Parliament and Parliamentary democracy in the House of Commons in England, there are three distinct measures which they would probably consider of a totalitarian and dictatorial nature. There is first the Guillotine, then the Kangaroo and the Closure, and a debate on any Bill before the House of Commons may be curtailed even if the Opposition wants to continue by invoking either one of these procedural measures. We have never had recourse to that in the House of Assembly. I would like to read from Sir Erskine May on page 575 in order to get the record straight, because I consider it is a screaming waste of time, when hon. members of the House of Assembly do not disagree with a single clause in a consolidating Bill, that we should go through the farce of saying "it has been moved and seconded that Clause 17 stand part", "it has been moved and seconded that Clause 18 stand part" and so on *ad infinitum* to Clause 263 and then all the parts of the Schedule. If that is not a screaming and absolute waste of time and the kind of thing that drives people crazy, I would like to know what is.

Again I preface my remarks by saying that under the particular circumstances the very members have not objected to our getting through with the business of the people, and they said that they have no objection to a single Clause in the Bill. The hon. junior member for St. George said that he is entirely familiar with it because consultation was made during his tenure of office and I have no doubt that he is. *A fortiori* he should have no objection to not wasting the time of the taxpayers or the time of the House either. The idea that we have to go through some sort of mediaeval torture to arrive at a conclusion we have in our minds is pure, unadulterated nonsense. This is no horse-and-buggy or snowball-cart age; and if they want to accuse me of being a dictator by not wasting the time and by the destruction of people's personality and mental capacities by this kind of procedure, then let them accuse me of being a dictator; but I am not going to live my life in this kind of way.

I only want to point out to hon. members that Sir Erskine May on page 575 of the Fifteenth Edition of Parliamentary Procedure said this:-

"Forms not binding in progress of Bills.- The forms commonly observed by both houses in the passing of Bills having been explained, it must be understood that they are not absolutely binding. Though founded upon long parliamentary usage, either House may vary its own peculiar forms, without question elsewhere, and without affecting the validity of any act which has received, in proper form, the ultimate sanction of the three branches of the legislature. If any informality be discovered during the progress of a

bill, the House in which it originated will either order the bill to be withdrawn, or will annul the informal proceeding itself, and all subsequent proceedings; but if irregularities escape detection until the bill has passed, no subsequent notice can be taken of them by the other House, as it is the business of each House to enforce compliances with its own orders and practice."

Anybody can challenge anything we do; but when you say something has not been done traditionally, after all, a Bill is only the instrument by which you want to go on to do something else. There is nothing sacrosanct about the Bill itself; it is only the machinery we are going to invoke to allow trade and commerce to flow freely in and out of Barbados. What is the great business of going through a liturgical chant to pass Clauses 17, 18, 19, 20 etc. when every single member of the House has indicated - and is still of the opinion - that this is a consolidating Bill and there is nothing controversial about it. As far as I am concerned, if there is a single dissentient voice on this matter, the hon. senior member for St. Philip did not suggest that we are going to put anything to the vote; he asked for information that I would welcome members expressing an opinion, no matter how misguided it may be - and that is not anything of a personal reflection - in a calm and unprovocative manner. I do not believe in departure from tradition being wrong anyhow; and if a member gets up and says he believes in tradition, we would get up and say that we do also.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am a provocative individual and I do not believe in tradition for tradition's sake either. I do not believe in anybody reading out things to me. I am not going to make any *apologia* to anybody because of my knowledge about anything. The Premier could not be more wrong when he talked about the United Kingdom. He is so wrong that he could not read anything showing me that this has happened in the United Kingdom. He just read "May's", but "May's" is the opposite to what he was saying, because in "May's" you can debate anything you care to debate. At the beginning the hon. member talked about the Guillotine. We have the Guillotine here if he talks about that, and we can close a debate because somebody can ask that 'the question be out'.
1.50 p.m.

That is not in Standing Orders, but what is happening here today is that the Government has introduced a Bill and is saying that we are wasting time. When we are debating anything, how can you say that you are keeping back anybody? What I am objecting to today is what I objected to when the last Government was in power. When the last Government came in with these matters, as soon as the First Reading was passed, they did not want any debate on the matter when the Bill was in Committee. What happened was that they were all in a hurry to get through these things and now they are outside playing "draughts".

I am warning the Hon. Premier. Before you become impertinent so early, you better take a little introspection. It is just three months after the elections and you are talking about people coming in here and sitting down wasting time and you do not want to do this. You are the Premier of this Island, but you are not the boss. A man who felt he was the boss is now in England talking foolishness. You are dealing with equals. The Hon. Premier talked about misguided people. Whom do you think you are talking to? Do you think that you are talking to people in a witness stand? Where did you get your information from? I challenge the Hon. Premier. Let me say that we are not departing from what we have been accustomed to in this Chamber. It is our fundamental right to consider this Bill, clause by clause and nobody can take that away from us. If you do not want to hear us, go out. The others were impertinent and I told them that they were getting too impertinent and soon they will find themselves outside. Some of the present hon. members are talking the place of those impertinent ones who are now outside. I am warning you. If you are getting impertinent you should stay where you were in private life and should have never entered public life.

Sir, we could have passed all the sections of this Bill by now in the way that we were considering them. I am going

to oppose it now because I resent the slightest semblance of your taking away from people something without giving them any prior notice. The point which the hon. member has raised is that we have no objection to the Bill. We do not have any objection; but do not say that because we did not oppose the Bill on the Second Reading, we cannot speak on it now that it is in Committee. Why must I tell him which clause I am going to speak on? I do not have to do that. There is no rule saying that I should do that. The Hon. Minister said that we sat down and never said one word on the Second Reading. That has absolutely nothing to do with it. This afterthought business by the Hon. Minister would not do. When this Bill was being pushed through just now, I came to the conclusion that there must be some underlying reason for pushing it through so quickly.

This is Parliament. Do you think that we are in a rum shop and were drinking for a long time and all of a sudden, one of us said "we were drinking for a long time, let us take one for the road?" I repeat, I am warning the Hon. Premier because the people will not be able to say that you did not get a warning. Do not get the arrogant idea that nobody can warn you. Do not get the idea that because you are Premier, somebody is under your feet. Cut that out of your head! You are inside here as an equal, with other hon. members in Parliament. If you are getting the idea that somebody is beholden to you, get that out of your head. Speaking for myself, do not get the idea that I am looking to anybody for something. I have suffered too much already from dictators. They are no members of parliament under whom I would want to sit down. I want to be in a position to exercise my freedom, and not for myself but for the people of this country. The Hon. Premier is showing early examples in wishing to make inroads into the freedom of people and I am going to say that any semblance of it must be put down at the first moment. I will go all over the country and tell the people: "down with dictatorship".

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not going to be too long. I am addressing my remarks to the Hon. Minister. I wonder that what his former colleague, the late Mr. "T. T." Lewis would have said when he raised that point. I have always taken the stand that when you come down here with a Bill of this magnitude - and this is a Bill of 188 pages with 263 sections - you should not pass it in this House in such a way that the next week you see in the Press that the Other Place had to amend it and it is coming back here for us to deal with the amendments.

Now, I am going to show you an example why we should not deal with this Bill in a hurry and we should take it section by section. It is true that there is no objection to the principle of the Bill but look at Section 19 which reads as follows:-

"There shall be raised, levied, collected and paid unto Her Majesty, Her Heirs and successors....."

Surely, you do not need a capital "H" for "Heirs"; that should be a common "H".

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 o'clock, I declare this Sitting suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, the time for the suspension of the sitting having passed, and there being no quorum present, I ask Your Honour to ask the Clerk to ring the bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. senior member for St. George for his vision.

On the bell having been rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a close shave. The meeting would have been adjourned if the time allowed for the ringing of the bell had expired. There were only two more seconds to go.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Are there any answers to questions ready?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: No, Sir.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION *re* SCHEME TO AID OLD AGE PENSIONERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on a Resolution *re* scheme to aid Old Age Pensioners in the repairs of their homes. On the last occasion when the Resolution was being considered, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Social Services, was addressing the House. The Hon. Premier spoke on a point of order, but before then the Hon. Minister of Social Services was speaking. I gather that the Hon. Minister had not completed his address, and therefore it is now his right and privilege to resume his speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying on the last occasion, we on this side of the House, are just as much, or even more, concerned about the Old Age Pensioners than the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. We all feel that help should be given to these people; we all feel that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph brought in this Resolution with all good intentions; but, in the light of the economy of this island, I rather think that this Resolution, or rather I would say, the action of this Resolution could not take priority over many of the other projects which the Government is presently putting through. Let us take, for example, the construction of the new Hospital. Already we are asked to spend an additional two million dollars on it, and that \$2 million must come out of the Treasury of Barbados because we have already had a grant from C.D. & W. We have already gone to the Labour Welfare Fund for \$2 million. If, for some unknown reason, fate would have it that there is a strike in England in the steel works, etc. it would mean that more than the \$2 million which we are asked to provide for the completion of this Hospital would have to be obtained. As I said on the last occasion, we have gone so far as to decide to increase the amount paid to the Old Age Pensioners as from the next financial year. The increase in the amount of the Old Age Pension would require \$130,000 per year more. I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can see as clear as crystal that we, on this side of the House, have the interest of the Old Age Pensioners at heart. Presently we are contributing a considerable amount - as a matter of fact, a vast amount of money which is spent on matters relating to my portfolio goes to the Old Age Pensioners, and there are dozens of other people in this island who are in worse condition than many of the Old Age Pensioners.

2.40 p.m.

That is why I said that the Resolution brought in by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph cannot claim priority. In the light of the Island's economy, we have got to be very careful what we choose as priorities. Now, as I pointed out to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and to this Chamber on the last occasion, we are not opposed to it and I do not think I should stand here and make a long drawn-out speech when in principle it can be clearly seen that we would not oppose a matter such as this; but as I said before, we will deal with the priorities, and when the time comes for us to deal with a matter like this, we will be quite willing to handle it. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it would be necessary for me to say anything more on this.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. junior member for St. Joseph replies - and I take it he will want to wind up discussion in a couple of minutes - it was rather interesting to listen to the Minister.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, how is it possible for the hon. junior member for St.

George to get up and speak after the Minister has replied? The only person, according to the Rules of the House, who can stand and speak now is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, unless the hon. junior member for St. George has transferred himself to St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a right to wind up a debate if it is critical of the Government, but in any event the hon. junior member for St. George has not yet spoken, according to my note of those who have spoken; and it is a matter under Private Members' Business. The hon. junior member for St. George is therefore in order.

Mr. MILLER: I thought the hon. member might be willing to stand up and apologise for the remarks he made in connection with his power and authority. Earlier on today we were discussing dictatorship, and I really do not know, Mr. Speaker, where we are going.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the moment, we are discussing Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. As I said, it is lamentable to listen to the hon. member talking about "heart". What part of the anatomy is the heart? The Minister's interpretation would be different from other members of the House. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we decide we want to keep quiet, and I am not in for unnecessary talk and chat; but the hon. member is talking about priorities and saying that the majority of money is spent on Old Age Pensioners.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I did not say the bulk of money; I said a vast amount of money allocated to my Ministry is spent on old age pensioners.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a proper point of explanation.

Mr. MILLER: I suppose we must bear with these things. I take it that from time to time we grow accustomed to the folly that is shown in debates in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George was not always a seasoned Parliamentarian; he had to learn too.

Mr. MILLER: I would hate to think that Your Honour is directing the debates of this House. Is it because he is concerned with Party loyalty and not using his position as Speaker of the House to give us access to the debates rather than attempt to determine what pattern the debate should take? Anyhow, what is wrong with the question asked by my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph? We are told by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that he has got the Old Age Pensioners at heart. I am wondering what part of one's anatomy he is thinking about as the heart. He got up here like a dictator saying that I could not speak after the Minister. It is elementary, childish courtesy in a debate, even if a matter is handled by the Minister, to give way always. That power and authority is only used by the Speaker if he thinks it necessary in the interest of debate to curtail the freedom of an hon. member; but this is Private Members' Business, and this dictatorship has been going on all day. I do not want to be unkind and say anything shabby to the hon. member, but I do not know where we are going.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, let us get back to the homes of Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. MILLER: We are so mixed up with this unusual raw material that one cannot resist the temptation of replying to these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may only apply to lesser mortals than the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: I know it is the Speaker's responsibility to permit.....

Mr. SPEAKER: My reference to lesser mortals cannot apply to the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: Is the hon. member on a point of order? As I was saying, Sir, it is rather unfortunate; but I remember the hectic debate we had in this House on these down-trodden Old Age Pensioners and the increase which the Government gave of some five cents a day. We are told that in the Estimates we will discover a suitable change in Government's allocation to the needs of the community, but we are now reminded that there are other people who are suffering equally. I understood the Minister to say that there are some worse off than Old Age Pensioners and he would have to consider priority. I am not really in the mood to take the Minister to pieces, but on more than one occasion he has exhibited that flounce, or whatever you call it. I suppose we will have an opportunity in another few days when discussing the Estimates; but what assurance have you given my colleague? The Government accepts it, Mr. Speaker, because they would lose some votes on it; but they cannot say it would fall under priorities. Anyhow, what is happening, Sir, and where are we going? Are we looking forward to the day when decisions will be taken in Cabinet and people would not know what is likely to happen as under the form of dictatorship you think of in terms of other countries? What does the Minister understand to be his responsibility?

Mr. Speaker, if a member wants to open a debate, the Minister should give way in the interest of the community. I do not know that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants any support from me as he is an old Parliamentarian, but I think it would be rather unusual for the Minister of Social Services to get up and display such an attitude, particularly to the aged and those who are down-trodden.

Mr. Speaker, something seems to be happening to this microphone. It is somewhat temperamental.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is because the hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we are always addressing the Chair, and I assure you of my responsibility to the Chair; but sometimes I am tempted to ask if the Speaker is on a point of order and if it is consistent with the Standing Orders of his Party. Anyhow, I do not know I need say anything further except to lend my support to a measure which every other member is bound to vote for. However, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will say what he thinks fit to bring this debate to a close.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who has not contributed to this debate who would like to give his point of view before I ask the Introducer to reply? Eleven hon. members so far have contributed including the Hon. Mover. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph may now exercise his right of reply.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it would appear from some of the speeches which I have heard from hon. members who spoke on this matter that some of them believe that I am trying to make out a case for every individual pensioner. I am not making out a case for those pensioners who are in receipt of a pension of \$100, \$200 or even \$80 a month. I am trying to make out a case for those people who are in receipt of old age pension of \$2.15 a week from the Government and the other little pittance which is as low as 25 cents a week from the various Public Assistance Committees in the country districts. Those are the people whom I want this Government to consider making repairs to their houses and to make those repairs first priority.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services said that there are other things to do and to which you must pay attention first. What can be more urgent than to help a poor person who is 80 years of age, or 60 years, who is living in a house which you would not want to put an expensive cow in? It is very easy for an expensive cow to catch red water disease and die if it is not provided with good shelter; so you have to make a shelter for that class of animal watertight. Some of those people whom I am talking about, live in houses in which the floor is bad, the siding is bad and the roof is bad. What is the use of Government thinking of spending \$10,000

to increase the old age pension of those people and yet those people are lying down at night in a decrepit house? What is the use of giving such a person a good dinner this afternoon and tonight when he turns in, instead of his being able to take a rest, he has to sit up and watch his bed getting wet?

The Minister is telling me that we have to attend to other things first. I do not know if he knows anything about these people, but I can tell him that these people are badly in need of help. The hands of the Housing Authority are tied. The Housing Authority cannot help in the repair of these peoples' houses because these people are not qualified to receive such help; therefore, I am asking the Government to find the money to assist these people in the repair of their houses. I am not asking the Government to repair the homes of people who are in receipt of a pension of even \$40 a month.

Sir, I as a politician know these poor old people. I am sorry that I have to say this now, but at present, I am paying a "Coolie" man every Monday morning a certain amount of money for an old lady who is not able, or never was able, to pay him for a mattress which she had to take up from him to lie on. As a matter of fact, after I saw her condition, I told her to arrange with the "Coolie" man and send him to me every Monday morning for the money. My colleague has to do the same thing. We cannot do all; therefore, we are asking the Government to give this matter priority. I am asking this Government who travelled all over this country and made those sweet promises which have caused them to capture the Government and who are now telling the same people that they cannot help them, to help these people by repairing their houses. The Government is now telling the same people that it has to build the Hospital and do other things first. That Government told the people to put them in power, and when they got in power they would help them. Now, they are telling them today: "We have no money". What is going to become of those people who are living in homes which are tumbling down? Those people are suffering and I invite the Government to pay a visit to some of those people's homes in the country, not in St. Joseph alone, but in other parishes like St. Thomas and St. Lucy, and I am sure that, after they have seen the condition of those homes, they are going to say that this matter should be given priority.

When the Hon. Minister of Social Services said that he is in favour of this Resolution and that he would never be against a matter of this sort, but there are other things to pay attention to first, well, he does not know the condition of these homes. He did not have the opportunity to go these peoples' homes. Of course, Sir, a Principal of a school does not have to walk about and visit peoples' homes. He has to sit at his desk and the people come to him; but I, as a struggling undertaker, have to go and visit all sorts of homes. We are not now talking about politics; we are dealing with one making a living. As I have said, a Principal cannot know the condition of these people because his job is in a school sitting at a desk - and I will go as far as to say that he does not draw money like the poor undertaker, because the poor undertaker has to take \$1.00 or \$2.00 from people when he can get it but a Principal draws fees, and whenever he draws fees, the money is mainly blue-back pieces.

Sir, this is for people who cannot help themselves. The only way that these people can get help now is when an Alderman or a Councillor of a district pushes his hand in his pocket and helps them. It is only yesterday that an Alderman from a certain District Council said that there are no poor people in Barbados. That Alderman should be court-martialled when he said so. That Alderman said: "If Councillor Smith wants to see poor people, let him go to Trinidad." I had to tell him that I do not have to go to Trinidad to see poor people because I am not a representative for a Trinidad Council. He is no less a person than Alderman A. G. Johnson.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Councillor A. G. Johnson is not in this Chamber at present, and it is unfair for the hon. member to bring in here what that gentleman said, and what transpired in the Council and so indict the Alderman who is not here in this Chamber to defend himself.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in here is the people's business. If the hon. senior member for St. James wants to do business in a bedroom, let him do it at his home; but this is the people's business.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a pity. I wonder if the hon. member thinks that this Chamber is synonymous with a bedroom. I can assure him that I do not regard it as a bedroom.

Mr. SMITH: A member representing the people cannot expect to be doing private business. We are doing Private Members' Business, but not private business. (Laughter) 3.00 p.m.

Whatever is said here can be known anywhere; it goes into the Press and all over the world. I now see why they wanted to chase out the Press yesterday. However, I can tell you; let the hon. member straighten up and go right; do not try to shield anybody but yourself. We have people walking all about and begging their bread; they have to do that. What is meant by your Government having to bring about a crash programme? Was it for the rich people? I thought that that would be for the purpose of helping the poor.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, it hurts my feelings to hear the hon. member say that Alderman Johnson said that we did not have poor people in Barbados. What he said that we do not have as many as they are in other places.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. senior member for St. James should scold the hon. senior member for St. Andrew for bringing something out now, too. (Laughter) We are representing the people; and the only way in which we can get anywhere, the only way in which we can hold a seat in this Chamber, is to make promises and carry them out. It is very easy to make the promises, but it is another matter to carry them out. I am dealing with a very vexed people; these people are responsible for the wealth of this country; they have worked hard for a very small pay. Comparatively speaking, they have worked for nothing. Some of them have tried to raise homes and some of them have not raised any homes at all; but those who have managed to raise homes cannot keep them in repair. It is not fair for the Government who has made these promises to the people to say that they do not have the money to spend. It would not break the Government to spend a little money to tighten up these houses.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I appreciate the hon. member's sentiments; but I would like him to tell the House what proportion of the total number of these old people's houses have fallen into disrepair within the last three months. Perhaps the hon. member can clear that up.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Education wants to make himself ridiculous he can do that. How can he expect me to tell him island wide how many of these houses over the last three months have fallen into disrepair? That is not anything which has just happened. (Hear! Hear! and Laughter) What difference does it make? They can cheer and they can laugh. I did not make these old people's homes old; it is the Government which went and found fault with the works of the last Government and told these same people that they are being trampled and broken down. I heard one of the same hon. members 'lower side' tell somebody; "If you put us in power and you work for one day a week we will pay you for six." (A MEMBER: That is a lie.) (ANOTHER MEMBER: That is misleading). That is what has happened.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that he heard an hon. member 'lower side' say that if people work for one day a week we will pay them for six. Well, will the hon. member tell the House which hon. member 'lower side' he heard say so?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. member to rope me into anything. If that hon. member had spoken against this Resolution, then I would have called his name; but the hon. member had been very quiet on it. You cannot make me call anybody's name.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. We categorically state that the hon. member cannot call the name of any hon. member 'lower side' whom he heard make a statement like that. I am asking the hon. member, if he does not want to be accused of speaking an untruth, to call that hon. member's name.

Mr. SPEAKER: That hon. member cannot be referred to by name.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. I would not be able to sit down here and hear the hon. member say that one of the hon. members representing the parish of St. Andrew had made a statement and said that if anybody worked for one day, this Government would see that he got six days' pay. I know that I have never spoken those words.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not specify which constituency.

Mr. CORBIN: The parish of St. Andrew is the last parish, and therefore I would always think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph means that parish.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, this matter is much too serious to be passed over like that.

The hon. member has made certain remarks which reflect on one side of this House. I rise to ask the hon. member, through Your Honour, whether he heard me say that or not.

Mr. SMITH: The members 'lower side' should know by now that my shoulders are broad and they can stand for anything; those hon. members cannot rope me into anything. I can stand up to anyone of them. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has said that I would be regarded as not speaking the truth if I did not call any name; but I would not be the first person who would be regarded as not speaking the truth in this House. Before the hon. member was elected to a seat in this House, I read in the newspapers from members who are still in this House as to how untruthful some hon. members are or were; therefore those hon. members cannot move me. I can be regarded as anything; but I will still maintain that the hon. member, from whom I have heard the statement which I have mentioned, is very silent today on this Resolution and therefore I will not call any name.
3.10 p.m.

That was said in more than one parish. So many promises were made that they do not even remember what they promised to the poor people; so I am here now to see that they carry out those promises. They cannot put me out from here unless I do something very wrong before the time comes, and I am here to see that every promise which was made by the present Government members is carried out, and I am going to remind them as soon as they forget.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, what we should like very much is for the hon. member who is speaking to indicate, by constituency or whatever form he likes, which hon. member on this side of the House made this promise to which he has referred. It is fairly simple; he has made an allegation and should substantiate it.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I will get along with this Resolution. The hon. member ought not to be so unhappy because I did not get as far as St. Philip; so I do not know what he said up there. I did not go to St. Philip, nor do I think I would go back there on a political platform. Some time ago I had to run helter-skelter to the Police Station in St. Philip to save myself; so I would never go back up there. If my son was running up there, he would have to run as he could.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member is begging the question. He has accused a Government member of having made this statement. It is not fair to the Government benches, unless he can justify it. We want to know who it was, since the hon. member knows it.

Mr. SMITH: You will know in time! Anyhow it was said and I mentioned it on all the platforms. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Oh, by yourself!) The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is very touchy.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot be accused of being touchy. I asked the hon. member if I had said it, and it was a simple thing for him to answer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member if I am guilty of having said that if a person worked for one day, he would get paid for six days in any parish.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be childish; but I am not a child. I replied to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; and now if I should answer the hon. senior member for Christ Church, everyone of them will be getting up and asking. As soon as the House adjourns, I will walk over there to them and call the man's name in private. I will be a man and not do it now because this is not a scandal; it is the truth.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph stood on the floor of this House and said that one hon. member from this side of the House made that statement. Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did a lot of campaigning in St. Andrew in an effort to stop me from having a seat. I am wondering if during his campaigning in St. Andrew and going around the meetings the hon. junior member for St. Joseph heard me mention anything of that sort.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult to reply to the hon. member, because I heard him say something in Chalky Mount one night and in Belleplaine he denied it. I heard him say something in Chalky Mount with my own ears, but in Belleplaine he did it like the new dance; he "twisted" it; so if I said so now, he will twist that now too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member revert to homes of Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. SMITH: Now, the hon. senior member for St. Philip said in his remarks that I should know, being a member of the last Government, the financial position of the colony. Suppose I said "yes" or suppose I said "no"; that still does not mean that the present Government is not in a financial position to help these poor old people, because you will have to find money from somewhere to help them. You are the Government and the people are suffering. They are living comparatively speaking nowhere; and it is not a nice thing that people should have to push paper in holes or get tin and nail over holes to keep water out of their homes when a Socialist Government is in power. The time has come now.....

Mr. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, on a point of order, again he is misrepresenting his own position. The question which I asked a moment ago and which I ask again is this: of the number of old people's homes which need to be repaired, what percentage has fallen into disrepair in the last three weeks? If we know that, we may be able to do something. How many there were originally and for how long, and how many have spoken to him personally?

Mr. SMITH: I could not deem that as a sensible question. I do not think an idiot would ask me that question. If the hon. member wants to embarrass me, he can try; but he cannot embarrass me. I am not saying that the present Government is responsible for it or that they are the cause of it; I said just now that these houses have not gone bad overnight, and they jeered and laughed. If he wants to jeer and laugh again, I can reply to it; but because these houses were so all the time, must they remain so now? Do you mean to say that because I may have been a vagabond or a gambler and a thief for the last forty years, it is not possible for me to become a Christian? Is it not possible that I can go and kneel down and say my prayers and say "Lord forgive me for what I have done? I will tell you, Sir, what caused me to get so interested in these old people's houses.
3.20 p.m.

It was only last year — and my colleague will bear me out — that we had complaints before us of the condition of an old lady's house. Our Public Assistance Officer laid before us the matter: and when we went and visited that house, we saw that it was everything in the world except a house. The Public Assistance Officer was then given instructions to find out if there were any other houses in the district like that, and to make a report on them. He did so and we then paid a visit to them. I would say here that my colleague was on the Public Assistance Board longer than I. It is true to say that these people never made any complaint about the condition of their houses. They just come and draw the little pittance. The hands of the Guardians' Committee were tied; but it is also true to say that no report was made about the condition of these houses. One particular old lady reported the condition of her house to the Public Assistance Officer and she was told to come in and make a report to the Board.

Sir, we cannot repair these houses for these people because there is no provision in the Estimates for it. What we do sometimes is this. A member would take money out of his pocket and help an individual to buy a bundle of shingles or anything like that.

The Hon. Minister says that these people's houses were in the same condition as when I was a member of the last Government and that I never said a word about it. Whether it is that I have now come in with this Resolution, and my jaws were closed all the time until now, I want to enlighten the hon. member that these poor old people never complained before. They just came to the Board and drew the little pittance which was given to them as a pension. There is another thing. These people's houses are not situated on the public highway; they are sited all the way in the back. We made a survey and found that those people were living in shacks. During my campaign, my eyes were wide open and I saw all the houses. I believe that some of them were never repaired for the last 20 years. As a matter of fact, the people to whom they belong are not able to keep them in repair, and the \$2.15 a week for old age pension, and 25 cents or 50 cents pittance which they get from the Board cannot repair a house.

Sir, it is not everybody who would like to go to the Alms-house and live. You must also bear in mind that if these people go there to live, it would cost the taxpayers more money because you would have to build more Alms-houses. You cannot put people who are well in the same place which you have for sick people. Therefore, you will see that it will cost a lot of money, from the point of view of the Councils, if you have to make provision to house these people; and I am sure the Councils will not be able to carry it out. The Central Government, which is the mother, will have to see after her children. As you know, Sir, sometimes a father can leave out his children, but not the mother. She has to try and hover them.

This is a democratic government; this is the Government that used the broom; this is the Government that is doing everything possible to make a new Barbados. If the other members of former Governments were murderers, well, do not be a murderer now! Do not step into the same shoes! If you want to say that I am a member of the last Government and you are not going to do what this Resolution asks because I have survived, leave me out and think of the people.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised a very good point when he said that we should not look at this matter in any chess-playing manner; but my advice to the Government is that while the grass is growing, the horse is starving. Therefore, why wait for a big bundle of meat to give the horse when you can gather a little bit for it? While you are waiting for the big bundle, you will find out that, when you carry it, the horse is dead. We have to think of these people. I am appealing to the Government, and to the Hon. Minister of Social Services particularly, to give this matter priority. He knows, as well as I do, their plight because he has come from the country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member says that I know as well

as he does. Earlier in the debate, he said that I do not know the condition of these people and he also said that as a schoolmaster, I do not know, but he would know. He later said that he only knew of the condition of these people after the last campaign, and after those people came to the Public Assistance Board and reported the matter.

I would like, first of all, to let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph know that I went to every possible house in the constituency in which I contested a seat and I thought that he would have gone to all the houses in his constituency too — and even before then, because he has been representing his constituency for over seventeen years.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: He has gone off the point now.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister is not a politician yet. When I said that the hon. member's job was in a school and at his desk, I meant to tell him that I was outside. I am coming home now. I am not so foolish to think that he would not know of the condition of these people's houses. However, his remarks would make one to feel — those people who do not know him — that he did not know the condition of the houses because when he said, "first things first", one would think that he did not know.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister now, and am reminding him, that he is from the country too and he knows the condition of these people's houses. I do not think he was too small to know, because he came from the country when he was a boy. He came from the country since he was a boy; but he still would know that these poor old people catch 'H-E- and two sticks when rain falls, and their houses begin to leak. When rain falls, it goes all over their houses and they have to sit up. I know of an old lady who had to sit on a box whenever the rain fell, although she was a sick woman. That is what is existing now with most of them. How on earth if the present Government believes what I am saying — and that must be so because all of them are in sympathy with the principle of the Resolution — how can they dare to say that we have to spend money on the Hospital and then some on increasing the old age pension and, therefore, because "first things first", they cannot make the houses of these people watertight?

3.30 p.m.

It may be some old grandmother or great-grandmother of theirs, and one would be laughing and closing his eyes to such conditions. I am saying, Sir; do not let us leave out these poor people because they need help. You will be only fooling the people that you cannot help them; you will not be fooling me. The Hon. Minister of Trade has said that it is a question of how much money the Government can spend. Well, that is so; but when they were making these promises to the people, they did not say that such promises or the fulfilment of them depended upon the amount of money which the Government could spend. They said that they would do these things for the people if they put them in power. It is the promises which they made to the people which have caused those Ministers to be holding those red boxes now. This is my warning; if you do not carry out these works, those boxes will be taken away from you.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. I would like to know from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph if we promised to repair the houses of the Old Age Pensioners. The things which we have promised are what we are fulfilling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to point out that a point of order is best when it is brief.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult to learn a big person parliamentary procedure. Those hon. members on the other side want to reply, and they want to embarrass and confuse me. The Hon. Minister knows as well as the world that he is breaking the Rules of the House, but he must get in a little piece. However, it is a matter for Your Honour to allow him to put in that little piece; you are different from me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am having unnecessary difficulty with the hon. member. I wish to repeat the question which was specifically raised by my colleague. Is it that we promised in our Manifesto or in our last election campaign that we would repair the houses of these old people?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have never accused them of promising to repair the houses of these old people; I am accusing them of making promises, and it is on the promises which they have made that they have succeeded in holding those red boxes. If I got up and said that there is a fisherman at Bathsheba who voted for me and helped me to secure a seat in this House, must I call his name?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I should like to ask the hon. member if we promised to provide free secondary education.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that term "free secondary education" is still puzzling me. I understand that under this roof secondary education is free, but under that roof you have to pay for secondary education. I think I have read that parents who have children in the preparatory forms at Secondary Schools have to pay for them. If that is so, then secondary education is not free. Anyhow, I am answering the Minister now; when you are paying in one department of a school and the other department is free, would you call that free secondary education?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to say that my difficulty is that I cannot tell what is going to be said when an hon. member rises on a point of order until it is said. Anyhow, let us continue to discuss the question of the repairs of the homes of Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, while those hon. members 'lower side' might try to embarrass me, they cannot throw me down; they cannot do that physically or otherwise. I feel that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy did wrong when he mentioned free secondary education because you are paying in one way and you are not paying in another.

Mr. SPEAKER: And for the hon. member to repeat that is just as wrong.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I should like to ask the hon. member this question: How many Old Age Pensioners are living in houses which are in need of repair? If we have the statistics, then the Government could investigate the matter.

Mr. SMITH: If the Minister would give me a chance, I would get those particulars for him; but since they were in power — I speak under correction now — I asked the Hon. Premier a question and he said that he could not furnish me with the reply which I needed; and I could not fight him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to tell me which question that was. One of the occupational hazards is that of having the category of speeches made by the hon. member. The hon. member makes all kinds of statements which he cannot substantiate. I ask him: which question was it that he asked me which I could not answer?

Mr. SMITH: The question was in respect of the Alleyne School. I do not expect that every question I ask the hon. member can answer it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Which question was it in relation to the Alleyne School the hon. member asked that I could not answer?

Mr. SMITH: I asked how much land there is at present down there so that he was asking permission to buy more? The hon. member might forget that. If he is going to play the new dance, well, let him do it. (Mr. WALCOTT: What is the new dance?) The Twist. Let him ask me another one. Does the hon. member think that I am asking things or making statements which I cannot substantiate?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member asked me if there was sufficient land at the Alleyne School; he never asked about the amount of land there. The precise amount of land there was told to hon. members when I introduced the Resolution. It was all set out in the Addendum; but if the hon. member cannot read, I cannot help that.

Mr. SMITH: I asked the hon. member what was the amount of land belonging to the Government and the hon. member said that he could not tell me then; he said that he would have to check up and let me know. Well, if they can do the new dance, I cannot do it; I watched it last night. At this stage, I can only watch. (Laughter). Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I will get along with the Resolution because I am coming home now with an appeal. I have good reasons for appealing; this is a case which the Government should take in hand immediately. As to the figures which the hon. member wants to know, he could instruct the Housing Authority to find out and tell him how many of these old people's houses are in need of repair.
3.40 p.m.

In my opening remarks just now, I reminded this House that I am not making out a case for Government pensioners. It is only for those who are decrepit, people who are not able to work and who are depending on the \$2.15 and 50 cents per week which would be \$2.65. Those are the ones I am talking about, because when I use the words "Old Age Pensioners" I know of one who is an ordinary man and he draws more than I get per month as a pensioner, but he would still be regarded as an Old Age Pensioner. However, I refer to those poor old people who cannot get anywhere, and if you made a check you would not find so many to break the Government. One single cent more on income tax or on something would provide the necessary money for these poor people; but I am not here to tell you how to get money or where to get it from, though you must help these people. If you are going to ask where will the money come from, you are going to fall into the same boat, and I am warning you. This is a boy-in-the-yard warning the Principal of Harrison College, so to speak; but take my word and work on this. You can turn it down, if you like; because it is not for me; it is for the poor people and there is an old saying to the effect "you are nothing to do with who brings it, as long as the Lord sends it. If Satan brings it, the Lord has sent it". That is the cry of the poor old people today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, the hon. member is distorting the position of this Government. He does not have to make an appeal to us. We are in favour of the Resolution; but to say that we could turn it down and he would be glad is to distort the whole position. Last year when I divided the House on the question of old age pensions, he was one who voted against the increase.

Mr. SMITH: Is that a point of order?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course, it is a point of order. He voted against the increase.

Mr. SMITH: I am not talking about pensions; I am talking about repairs to homes, and you have it in your hands to do everything. You do not have to divide the House now; you can do everything now. You can make a motion to turn a man into a woman, or a woman into a man, because you have the numbers; but when you have these numbers, you pay for them after a time.

Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would not let me speak; it seems as though he has forgotten the old people now. I can understand the speech of the hon. senior member for St. James, because he said that this Government is having headaches and sleepless nights, and he was wondering whether it is an attempt on my part to embarrass the Government. If you are doing your job, you must have sleepless nights. Poor businessmen have sleepless nights. Do you think it is a bed of roses? If the members of the Government want to play bridge or play spree boys and do the "twist" and then go home and sleep, they would not get too far. You asked for the Government; nobody called you for it; so I do not know how the hon. senior member for St.

James is looking at it. When you are running a Government, you must have sleepless nights to get ends to meet; and you are going to get Resolutions like this and others coming here. Even the hon. junior member for St. Thomas wants to have telephones in St. Thomas. There is nothing wrong with that. Everything has to be done, but it takes money; but he cannot sit down and not let his people know that he is doing something, because if he keeps quiet now and the Government gets turned out, I would say that he had a locked jaw; so he has to do something and let his constituents know he is alive. As soon as the hon. junior member for St. Philip came in, he succeeded in getting something done — and he will stay there forever until he does something wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I must catch a few votes from this Resolution whether or not it passes. You must catch votes: otherwise you would not be a politician; you would be at home playing "warri". I am therefore appealing to the Government to take this Resolution seriously. I have made notes from the speeches of hon. members, but I do not want to go further because I see that Government is in favour of the Resolution and I am not going to throw a spanner in the works. I am appealing to them to use the same speed they are using in working on the payment of the same Old Age Pensioners in trying to get it to their homes rather than having them come on the streets to be knocked down. When the person carries the pension to a home, do not let it be a disgraceful home. Let the person see that it is a home worthwhile going to.

If you give me a chance, Mr. Speaker, by evening I would be able to tell them how much it would take to do it, but I do not want to fly into the face of the Ministers; so I will sit down with this last warning to the Government that they should do good, and good will attend them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I realise that the hon. member has replied; but very briefly, on a point of order, I will say that I have had occasion to study the Executive Committee Act of 1891 in a little more detail during the past week than I have been accustomed to devoting to the Executive Committee Act. I fully appreciate that the question of Resolutions and Motions and Questions are within the jurisdiction of the Speaker. We have no intention of trying to prevent members from introducing anything which they consider may render them a little more popular in the constituencies from which they may be evicted at the next General Elections, and it is for that reason and that reason alone that we do not challenge the question of the introduction of this Resolution by the hon. member. 3.50 p.m.

If you look at the Act of 1891, Chapter 22, you would see that in Section four, it says:

"The initiation of money votes by bill, resolution, or otherwise, by individual members of the House of Assembly shall cease, and shall be made only on the responsibility of the Executive Committee in the manner provided in this Act; provided always that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to restrict or in any way interfere with the right, hitherto always exercised by individual members of the House of Assembly, to introduce any bill, resolution, or any other measure of legislation, so that, as is hereinbefore provided, such bill, resolution or other measure of legislation does not create any charge upon the revenue of the Island, or in terms provide for the expenditure of public money."

It is particularly the last phrase to which I want to draw the hon. member's attention. We are not making any issue on this Resolution, but the hon. member made a statement before he sat down to the effect that he knows that hon. members are not going to implement the request which he has made. I want to make it clear to the hon. member that if the Government does not condescend to do what the Resolution asks, it is because we cannot at this stage on a Resolution not introduced by the Government permit this Government to spend any public funds, unless that matter has been carefully considered by the Cabinet.

I could have asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph a lot of other questions, just as, say, whether he or

his colleague on his right were doing anything on these matters. I do know that his position in the last Government was untenable. He was not an outsider in the true sense of the word: but there is no doubt that because of his views, he was a rank outsider; therefore, I commiserate with him in the same way that I commiserate with the Resolution. The hon. member nearly had me in tears at one stage until the hon. junior member for St. Lucy asked the hon. member, how many of those persons he had in mind. Then I realised that what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was trying to convey to you was that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was trying to consolidate his position at the next election. Whatever his motive may be, we regard this Resolution no more than a pious regard of goodwill to all mankind. I think any of us, who have grandmothers or great-aunts and people of that kindred, would sympathise with the lot of the poor, therefore, we would be in sympathy with this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier has made his point of order quite fully.

The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No".

In my opinion, the "Ayes" have it.

This Resolution is now passed.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item under Private Members' Business, stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John: To move the passing of an Address in reply to H.E. The Governor's Speech, delivered on the occasion of the opening of the Legislature.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the passing of an Address from this Honourable House to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the speech which he delivered at the opening of the Legislature. The Address has been circulated amongst hon. members and, therefore, there is no need for me to read it.

The purpose of the Address is to endorse the proposals contained therein for the implementation of the Government's programme as outlined in its manifesto. You will agree that very little time has elapsed since the Session began and therefore Government could not be expected to start on all their schemes.

There are two things, however, that have been begun. I refer to the crash programme which was instituted around Christmas time to provide work for the many unemployed in the Island. This took the form of work at Seawall, the Constitution River and the Deep Water Harbour site. The second project already started is the provision of free secondary education.

You will note that special mention has been made in the Address for the provision of a written and comprehensive constitution and the reform of the Legislative Council. This is a matter which my Party during the last Session has repeatedly advocated and we feel that it is much better to have a written constitution than to have the unwritten and very vague conventions under which this country has laboured during the past century.

Sir, I do not think that I should enter into greater detail about the policy of the Government, our plans for housing, transport, social security, etc.

I commend this Address to this Honourable House and now formally beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was under the impression that the hon. member was going to refresh our memories by reading the Address. I think that the hon. member should read it.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Address reads as follows:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1962.

2. The House note with approval the proposals outlined in Your Excellency's Speech with reference to constitutional reform, especially with regard to the provision of a written and comprehensive Constitution, and the reform of the Legislative Council.

3. The House are in complete agreement with the other main proposals contained in Your Excellency's Speech and beg to assure Your Excellency of their utmost co-operation in the implementation of the same.

4.00 p.m.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. senior member for St. James wants to speak on this Address at a later stage, he should notify me now that he has seconded the motion for the passing of the Address; otherwise he would not be entitled to speak unless he asks for leave to do so later on.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I will ask leave to speak later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, the hon. member is seconding the motion for the passing of this address and reserving the right to speak later.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity to speak now. In seconding the motion for the passing of this Address, it is not a question, as the hon. member has represented to this House, of words; it is a question of acts and deeds. Not so long ago, there was some talk about repairing the houses of the Old Age Pensioners, and I remember exactly what happened; it was that immediately this Government took over power, it set out to feed the hungry people. That shows that the Government regarded as a priority the question of feeding the people and providing employment for them. It is pretty clear and truthful and practical what is being sought by this Government, and I think that the country as a whole will see that when the Government made promises, not election promises, it was convinced of the conditions which were existing in the island. With the promises being made, the people of this island felt that they were deserted; and viewing the stand which the Opposition took, it was not necessary around the Election period for us to make promises as to our willingness to put right that which was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to say more on this Address because the acts, not the words, of this present Government so soon after it took over are there. In spite of the many commitments, this Government sought to provide employment and to feed the starving and hungry people who were on the threshold of their graves.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the third reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939. And the next Order also stands in the name of the same hon. member:- To move the third reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957. Both of these Measures have been referred to Select Committees and those Select Committees have not yet reported. I take it, therefore, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not propose to go on with either of these Orders today.

Order No. 5 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George:- To move the passing of a Resolution *re* Teaching of Civics in Schools. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

The next Order also stands in the name of the same hon. member:- To move the passing of a Resolution *re* Schemes for Workmen's Compensation, Pensions for agricultural workers, Mortgage Insurance for houses.

The hon. member is still not in his seat.

RESOLUTION *re* REDUCTION OF FISHERMEN'S INSTALMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:- To move the passing of a Resolution *re* reduction of instalments payable by fishermen on purchase of their boats. Is the hon. member prepared to proceed with this Resolution?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS fishermen experience great difficulty in meeting the cost of repairs to their boats as well as paying the instalments they are required to pay on the purchase of the said boats,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take immediate steps by legislation, if necessary, to have the amount of the instalments reduced by 50% so as to enable fishermen to meet their commitments and be able to maintain their families.

Sir, this is a scheme which the fishermen and the Government went into, I would not say blindly, but the fishermen of themselves were not in a position to know directly how much money they would have been able to repay per month or per period. After going into the matter and having to meet the maintenance costs of the boats and paying for the repairs, and the fishing season not going on throughout the year, the fishermen have found it very hard to meet their repayments. I understand that for the first three years, the repayment was \$432, for the fourth and fifth years it was \$324, and for the sixth year it was \$216; and at the same time the fishermen have to pay 3% interest on their loans. In other words, the amount which they have to pay for the boats would be roughly \$30.00 a month. For the fishing season to go on for about five or six months, and for the remainder of the year when the boats are hauled up, the repairs to these boats are very costly; it is surprising how much fishermen have to pay when the engines of these boats have to be serviced and so on. If these people have a family, it becomes very hard on them to meet their instalments. At the time when they had to repay, they were not in a position to say how much they would be able to repay; but to repay at the rate of \$30.00 per month and then a fisherman has to find a boat — when one wants a boat, he has to look for about \$600 to pay for the hull and then about \$2,160 for the engine.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, these fishermen try and raise the amounts, and I daresay they may borrow the money to build the boat and then borrow money again to instal the engine, then they have to repay both for the engine and for the boat; so they find it very hard to pay that amount to one person. They may have to be paying the lumber yard or whomever they get the money from, because these fishermen are not rich people; they are ordinary fishermen who have worked already with another boat owner and are trying to get their own, and thus they start out with a debt. Some of them have children going to secondary schools and things of that sort; so we must try and help them as much as we possibly can.

Here again, Sir, I am appealing to the Government to give this Resolution greater thought and see what they can

do by way of helping them to repay, because it is no sense keeping the amount at, say, \$30 per month — because if it is six years to repay \$2,160 it would be around \$30 per month — when it would be better to ask them to pay \$10 or \$15 which they could pay easily. I know of a particular fisherman at Bathsheba who lost his boat completely. Speaking under correction, I do not think it was sold for \$600; so he lost, and the Government lost too. I do not know if the Government collected from him, but as a Socialist Government you cannot encourage people to be dishonest, though at the same time the man was not able to pay. If a businessman knows that his customer is unable to pay, he would not press him. You only press the ones you know can pay and would not pay. If a man puts his cards on the table and convinces you that he could not pay, you would not go any further with him. So I am asking the Government to give this matter great thought and relieve them by reducing the amount by as much as they think fit, not necessarily 50%. You will have to go into it and see what can be done, because you will find some fishermen who only have themselves and are still living at their parents while others have a family. A greater hardship would be created on some of these fishermen than on others, but you would still have to make it in such a way that they would be able to repay the money and still maintain themselves.

I know for myself, Sir, that repairs to these boats are very costly, especially if you have to replace a new part to these diesel engines. They are very cheap and economical by way of fuel, but the parts are very expensive. You would be surprised to know that in some cases a fisherman has to pay as high as \$200 or \$300 when he finishes overhauling. When he has to overhaul his boat or put in a crankshaft, what little he makes during the season goes in repairs, and he still has debt to clear; so I feel, Sir, that after taking everything into consideration, they should be helped by reducing the instalment. They arranged to pay, not knowing that they would not be in a position when they moved off from a sail-boat to a powered boat. With the sail-boats you only had to buy and depend upon the wind; so that was much easier and you could repay it easily because you did not have to pay for repairs to the wind; but now you have helped yourself by putting in an engine, that is where the cost comes in, and it does not appear to me that these engines last very long. Erosion takes place and they rust out badly, and I understand there is a part which goes very fast and is very expensive to replace.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I do so because it is for a very deserving cause. It is not a matter of speaking because one may be able to speak; but when it is considered that these poor fishermen have to toil through the heavy and rough seas to earn their living and the long hours of work which they put in, and when it is considered that the fishing season on which they depend is so short and they have to repay these loans along with the other commitments which they have in keeping their boats repaired and soon, I feel that some consideration should be given to these poor fishermen who are doing such a duty to this Island of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in seconding this motion asking that something will be done in the interest of these poor fishermen by way of reducing the instalments on the loans which they have to repay.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, over the first few years in the fishing industry when the powered boats came into existence, fishermen did not find it so inconvenient to pay these loans as there were only one or two hundred launches, and in the first few years the loans from Government were repaid quite easily. At present it is not so much a matter of what fish are caught, but the price they receive for them. When the catches of fish are very small, the money received for them is quite adequate; but as soon as large catches are made in the Island, due to transportation and the number of boats in the industry, the fish are sold cheaply, and that is the main reason why they cannot get sufficient money to repay their loans. In certain of the parishes and along the coasts of the Island where there are

over 40 or 50 boats, fishermen must depend on trucks and pickups to bring fish from far in the country to Bridgetown. All the boats send their fish to Bridgetown when good catches are made, and the prices received for them are so low that they receive absolutely nothing to maintain their boats or pay the Government loans.

At present there is a project of cold storage coming into effect which we believe should be ready for the next season's fish, and I do hope that with that in force fishermen will be able to derive greater benefits and standard prices for their fish. Co-operatives are being formed now which should give them better chances of receiving better prices. All of us here know the hardships that fishermen undergo, their long hours of fishing — all hours at night and in the day — and the low wages they get.

4.20 p.m.

Some of them when they return cannot receive sufficient to feed themselves, furthermore their wives and children. Everyone of us, I am sure, would like to see them in the position where they could earn more and would thus be able to pay back the Government the loans for insurance. If it were possible to get a check over the last six years in the industry, you will see that the payments have decreased more and more. The reason for that is that more boats have come into operation, and as a result the price of fish has dropped lower and lower thereby keeping these fishermen in a position where they are not able to pay back their loans, furthermore keep themselves in good condition.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words on this fishing subject, I am glad to get the opportunity to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that while I am in favour of helping fishermen, because I know that some of them do need help, we should not fail to see that quite a number of people — and I am speaking now of the fish sellers, especially those in the town area — get a handsome profit out of it because as soon as the fishing boats come in, these people buy all the fish and then in turn sell the fish at exorbitant prices.

It is therefore the duty of the Hon. Minister in charge to notify the Police to keep a more stringent look out for these fish sellers. It is very hard, after the fishermen have ventured so far out in the deep to catch fish and then come back to sell them to fish sellers at a reasonable price, for these fish sellers to turn and sell them at a price which poor people cannot pay for them. It is all right for those people who have a deep freeze at home because they can buy them and store them up when the price is low; but it is very hard and difficult on the poor fellow who has to live on a day-to-day basis. Sometimes, he has to pay as much as 50 cents a pound for fish. The time is near at hand when a poor man would not be able to eat anything more than salt fish because he will not be able to pay these exorbitant prices for fresh fish.

It is time that we get more stringent on the fish seller. I would say that if a fisherman asks me to give a shilling for a flying fish, I would not think it too hard to do so because I know that these fishermen have to venture very far out to catch fish. It is not only the fishermen and the fish-sellers who have put us in power; it is also the other people who have put us in power.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the passing of this Resolution for a reduction of the payment which these fishermen have to pay for their boats. I have sat and listened to all that has been said, and I do not think that my Government today would be hard on any fishermen. We have come here to relieve the very hard pressure which these poor fishermen are faced with because we know the great interest which they have paid in helping the people of this community.

Sir, I do not like to stress this point, but I would have to relieve my mind. I remember speaking in this House sometime previously when the last Government was in power concerning the hardship of fishermen, and no notice was given to my speech by members of that Government; but I am going to show those who have remained of the last

Government that we have good intentions in our minds concerning the fishermen of this Island - and not only the fishermen, but every poor person in this Island. We have in our minds to do the very best we can for them.

Sir, I am not against the hon. junior member for St. Joseph bringing this Resolution because he has testified to-day that members of his Party when they were in power made mistakes, and he has gone as far as to ask forgiveness for them. Members of his Party failed to support members on this side of the House or the present Government when they agitated for such things; but we want him to realise that we who rule are going to do everything which is possible out of the goodness of our hearts.

When we think of the fishermen, we know that when we are in our beds, they are taking up their boats and going out into the deep blue sea to catch fish for us. Any Government in the world must think of the needs of fishermen and should support them because they know that fishermen are the up-keep of the people. Many a time, many of us would be glad to eat a fish but cannot get it. Some of us would pay any price for a fish but we cannot get it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue his speech at the next meeting. The time for Private Members' Business is at an end.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: This House now reverts to Government Business. When public business was completed this morning before the luncheon interval, the House was in Committee dealing with a Bill comprehensively affecting the subject of Customs.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 16, 17 and 18 were called separately and passed.

Clause 19 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it has been drawn to my attention that in the second line of Clause 19 that the capital "H" to the two words "Her Heirs" should be common letters. With that slight amendment, I beg to move that Clause 19 stand part.

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

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

4.30 p.m.

Clauses 20 and 21 were called and passed.

Clause 22 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 22 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, in the second line of this Clause the capitalisation of the word "Her" occurring after the words "Her Majesty" is quite unnecessary and that should be changed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Clerk has promised to take cognizance of errors of this sort.

With that correction, I beg to move that Clause 22 stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 22 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 23 to 68 inclusive were called and passed.
4.40 p.m.

Clauses 69 to 103 inclusive were called and passed.

Part IV was called and passed.

Part V was called and passed.

Part VI was called and passed.

Part VII was called and passed.

Clauses 206 to 225 inclusive were called and passed.

Part IX was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part IX stand part.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there is a jump from Clause 225. The next Clause should be 226.

Clauses 226 to 230 inclusive were called and passed.
4.50 p.m.

Clauses 231 to 248 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 249 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 249 stand part.

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

Mr. MILLER: Surely, Sir, you do not expect us to deal with this in this hasty manner. What is taking place? Let us resume at Clause 248.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That Clause has been dealt with already.

The question that Clause 249 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 250 to 263 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called and passed.

The Fourth Schedule was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1962"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1962" made by the Governor on the 5th day of February, 1962, under the provisions of subsection (2) of section three of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution is to make it possible that officers who serve in countries which have achieved independence and have declared their intention to remain in the Commonwealth and who have been transferred from service in those countries to any other Government should come under the provisions of the Pension Act. That sums up the position in a nutshell.

Clause 3 deals with that and Clause 2 is the interpretative clause. You will see that the recommendations now are making it possible for this to apply to:

- (a) the Government of any territory, or any authority, mentioned in the First Schedule to these Regulations;

- (b) the Government of Ceylon, in respect of any officer appointed to service under that Government before the fourth day of February, 1948;
- (c) the Government of Palestine, in respect of any officer appointed to service under that Government before the fifteenth day of May, 1948;
- (d) the Government of the Somali Republic in respect of any officer appointed to service under the Government of the Somaliland Protectorate before the twenty-sixth day of June, 1960; and
- (e) the Government of Cyprus, in respect of any officer appointed to service under that Government

This Bill is a very short one. There are only three Clauses - in truth and in fact there is only one substantive Clause and that is Clause 2. We have had a situation here, I may say from my experience, in which the Consul of the United States of America has actually paid taxes to the Southern District Council and the Executive Committee has had to refund the taxes to the United States Government. This is not a situation which obtains in any other territory in the Caribbean area. It was an oversight in the drafting of the Local Government Act of 1958 that an exemption was not given in the case of the different Consulates in the island of Barbados from the payment of Local Government taxes.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

C.
recom
added

I

F

put

the
Hon
to 2
C.
are
Bu
5.0

thi
Re

vi
th
S
ti
r
/

second time
ut division.

seconded by
hair and the
ATSON being

passed.
Mr. Chairman,
in Commit-

t.
the affirmative

AKER resumed

seconded by Hon.
as read a third

PENSIONS

at this stage I am
t, which has been
intituled an Act
n Act under which
sion. There was a
id Bill where the
rd "public". That
appear on page 2
this amendment,
e Bill in all of its

ch he has given, the
House to deal with
s forthwith. Unless
e granted the Hon.
ere is no objection,

; I beg to move that
act further to amend
n of the word "ser-
urth line of Clause 2

id that.
be now read a first
mative without divi-

should be exempted from the payment of the Local Government Act, 1958, and Government should refund any such rate that was paid before the coming into operation of the provisions which this Bill seeks to make.

This Bill therefore seeks to amend the Consular Conventions Act in order to give effect to the objects which I have just outlined.

On motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That finally concludes all business for today.

The Government's Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Business is there any request or shall Private Members' Business remain the same? In other words, what we were doing at the conclusion of Private Members' Business this afternoon was Order No. 7 on today's Order Paper which is now Order No. 1.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the Resolution of which I gave notice today be made Order No. 1. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not object to this Resolution becoming Order No. 1 in view of the fact that he had so much today. He had a field day in Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking that the Resolution of which he gave Notice today be No. 1 under Private Members' Business for the next meeting. There is no objection and leave is granted. The matter we were discussing this afternoon will then become No. 2.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that the Resolution re telephones in St. Thomas be made Order No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is asking leave that his Resolution be No. 3 under Private Members' Business, and if there be no objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that the Resolution of which I gave notice today be Order No. 4 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking leave that his Resolution be Order No. 4, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th March, 1962, at 12 noon.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think it is advisable for me to advise hon. members that we intend to commence debate on the Estimates for the financial year 1962-63 at the next meeting of the House on Tuesday, 13th March. As you know, Sir, we have to conclude the Estimates by 31st March as well as the Appropriation Bill, and therefore I would like hon. members to devote as much attention to the study of the Estimates as they possibly can, so that we are not met with the objection that members did not have sufficient time to study them. It was quite impossible for us to get the Estimates ready before now, and as a matter of fact I do not think we are unduly late. It would not be possible for me at this stage to say how many days it will be necessary for us to meet next week, but it is possible that we may have to meet one day outside of the normal meeting day of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there should be some indication on that. I do not like the idea of coming to the House and having these *ad hoc* adjournments. People have other business to perform, and it is the business of the members of the Government to run the Government in a way that private people can know what they are doing. I feel that if you are going to debate the Estimates next Tuesday, we should know today from the Gov-

ernment what is its intention. Do you intend next week to debate the Estimates on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday or Friday? You should tell us the days so that people can make their business arrangements to suit. You do not want to tell somebody to meet you on Wednesday and then find you cannot meet him because of a meeting of the House. The last Government used to do that, but it was a bad arrangement because people could not fix their business. It would be good for hon. members, other than the Ministers, to know the days so that they can arrange their business in case they are going to be here Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday or Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Estimates there must be some declaration as to the manner in which you are going to proceed, so that you can do things on a business like basis by knowing that you are going to devote three days next week to this business, maybe Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday or whatever days you like. I think we should know the days.

Mr. MILLER: Before the Hon. Premier replies, I would be happy if he would explain the procedure for next Tuesday. I take it the Premier's speech will take place after Committee of Supply and then you would move into Private Members' Business. I wonder if he is going to start with the debate on Tuesday or whether he is going to continue some time later that week.
5.20 p.m.

I can understand his dilemma at the moment. With so little time left before the end of March, there is going to be a rush. However, I am going to assure the Premier that the filibustering members are not on this side of the Table. I do not think I am asking too much of him when I ask him to explain what he has in mind so that we can make the necessary arrangements.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, members have been accustomed to so many malpractices during the time of the last Government because of misfeasance that they want to make a mountain out of a mole heap now.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has asked me to indicate what other days we are sitting; but I say that we doubt very much that we need keep members for any time longer than one additional day. The way in which Government Business is conducted, we may be finished next Tuesday; so the hon. member probably wants us to detain him forcibly a day in which he will be watching cricket. I cannot promise him to detain him in here when his services may not be required.

As far as the hon. junior member for St. George is concerned, the memorandum on the Estimates is very brief. The true and proper Budget Speech is going to be made sometime in May or early in June. In other words, the financial policy of the Government is not contained in the Estimates which we are being asked to consider next Tuesday. There is no Income Tax Bill or anything of that kind.

There is an interim capital expenditure of \$2,949,681 - which is approximately \$3 million - which will give hon. member some idea of the magnitude of Government expenditure on capital works for the coming year, and at this rate of expenditure it should be in the vicinity of \$12 million. We are going to follow the procedure in countries which pride themselves to be more advanced than Barbados and have a Finance Bill and have the Budget introduced after, possibly sometime in May or in June.

Sir, I am trying to allay the fears of the hon. member about our having a lengthy Budget Speech. We are also, as I previously indicated, bringing out an economic survey so that we would have a full knowledge of the background along which the country is going to be developed. Therefore, I think hon. members can be prepared to come next Tuesday to give consideration to the Draft Estimates, 1962-63. If, on the other hand, they find the introduction and memorandum so complicated after the Estimates have been introduced on Tuesday next, I am sure we on this side would be

willing to grant them the indulgence especially in view of the other impending events next week. As far as the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is concerned, it may not be necessary to sit more than one day next week.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 13th March, 1962, at 12 o'clock (noon), was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.30 p.m.