

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 21st March, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10 a.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALY; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL; and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*);

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform hon. members that the Minutes of yesterday's meeting are not yet ready.

I also wish to express my regret that there are no Order Papers yet available for today. Hon. members will recall that the House adjourned last night about 9.30 o'clock after a session which begun at 10 a.m. o'clock yesterday, and neither the typists nor the Government Printery has been able to get through with Order Papers for today yet.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18 be suspended for today's Sitting.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that that applies to today's Sitting which will terminate not later than 12 o'clock midnight?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg your pardon, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Today's meeting will have to terminate not later than 12 o'clock midnight, because the Suspension is for today's Sitting. I am not trying to curtail the meeting of the House.

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: We have no such ambition, Your Honour.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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, and that it be an instruction to the Committee while in Committee of Supply to deal with Order No. 2 on yesterday's Order Paper.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion the hon. junior member for St. George was addressing the Chair on Head 3 — Legislature.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think I had said all that was necessary on Item 6 and over the page on Item 26 with regard to the Speaker. Today I would like to say something on Item No. 9 — Leader of the Opposition. I think it is rather unfortunate, Sir, that the elections were held since 4th December, 1961 and today, almost four months later, no Leader of the Opposition has been appointed. It is true that this Item is fixed by law, but I believe at this stage in the interest of democracy, it is the responsibility of not only the Opposition but of the Government as well, to say something on this matter. The appointment of a Leader of the Opposition has been held in abeyance and left suspended in mid-air for some reason probably best known to the authorities that be.

I believe I am correct in saying, Sir, that there is an Opposition in any Democratic Government, and we are failing to carry out one of the tenets of democracy which is one of the processes of Parliamentary Government. My general unhappiness about this attitude is more or less stimulated by general expression by the public, and we are in trouble to understand why the hesitation, and why some decision has not been made. I think you are aware, Mr. Chairman, that when you fail to appoint an Official Opposition, you are toying with democracy, and this could easily be changed to a form of dictatorship as seen in the Latin Americas. I am unhappy for a number of good reasons, and that is why at this stage I think it necessary to comment on this, because we can see no real reason why a decision on the appointment has not yet been made.

The idea aback of this — and it is borne out by tradition and custom in the British Commonwealth of Nations and more particularly in the United Kingdom, Sir — is to appoint that group which forms the Opposition whether it happens to be part of the bloc or whether it happens to be the entire number of members forming the Opposition. The idea is to appoint a well organised Party that can be easily

identified as a Party; and it is not so much the question of numbers, but it must be a Party capable of taking over the responsibility of Government if anything should happen to the present or existing Government. I believe we of the Barbados Labour Party have got the only claim and the only right, and it has not been explained why we have been denied, as I have said, one of the early and fundamental tenets of democracy.
10.20 a.m.

Now, Sir, since Her Majesty the Queen has appointed in Parliament the position of Leader of the Opposition — and it now dates back to probably a century or more — the position has taken colour and dignity.

The reason why a member of the Barbados Labour Party should be appointed Leader of the Opposition needs not to be trotted out in here because it is so obvious. At the last elections, the people of the country decided to give this Party some 40,000 votes, which were more than were given to any other Party, and a membership of five seats. If you were to examine the situation as to what happened to the Barbados National Party, the Conservative bloc was given four seats. What has happened in the interim by way of the resignation from the Barbados Labour Party of one of its members is not a matter to affect the wishes of the electorate. The least that we can say is that it was the desire and express wish of the electorate of the country that the Barbados Labour Party should have more seats in this Chamber than the Barbados National Party. That is the first reason.

Now as regards the second point, suppose there be some reason, some international matter or rebellion, suppose something should happen to the ruling Party which forms the Government, if there be the question that a coalition should take place, the only answer to that is "no; we will not enter into a coalition with any Party."

Another reason why the Barbados Labour Party should be considered as the Party from which the Leader of the Opposition should come and which would meet with the approval of the people of this country and which is so obvious is that there is no reason on earth to believe that the Barbados National Party would ever enjoy the national appeal necessary to give them a majority of members in this Chamber to form a Government. I do not think that we need stress this because it is so easily obvious that any person is bound to know that this is the position. As a matter of fact, by the number of candidates which that Party put up for approval at the last elections, it can be seen that there was no intention on the part of that Party to win the Government. The minimum number necessary to form a Government is thirteen and they did not put up that number; hence it was not the intention of that Party to win the Government. That Party did not fight the elections on any Conservative philosophy or any manifesto, neither was it tied to any ideas of a Party to rule the country, and that was clear in the minds of the public generally. The whole of that party machine was tied to the name of the "Mottley Team". They fought the elections on that single character, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that you who are fast becoming a statesman, will agree that that is so, so far as that individual is concerned. The era of the Conservatives ruling the Government of Barbados is gone for ever. As a matter of fact, even the word "Conservative" is sometimes so much twisted as to form a betrayal of what it meant in the past. We have no doubt in this matter.

One of the reasons why Mr. Stockman was invited to come here was because we need advice on what to do with a Council which was spending \$2 million on public assistance. This Council is spending more money on the item, Poor Relief, than the total revenue of the little colony of Montserrat. Large countries, like small countries, have exactly the same problems. Each has to take care of Education, of the Church, of its Civil Establishment, of roads and water and to see after the Police.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think that I have to tell you this, but what on earth has that to do with this matter? What the hon. member is talking about now has nothing to do with the item which we are discussing.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if we have reached the stage where you think that you are incompetent, I think it would be good to say this. The hon. senior member for St. Peter should hear what you say; he should not be telling you what to do. We are in Committee and we can speak for a thousand times.

However, Sir, we were discussing this matter of Leader of the Opposition. I feel, Sir, the decision of naming the Leader of the Opposition lies in the hands of the Head of our State, the Governor, I have a copy of a letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the last Governor with reference to the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition. It is within the prerogative of the Governor; but there is precedent where if you think it is necessary, you can amend the Act to give the authority to the Speaker rather than to bring the Crown into it. In this case, there is no reason why this delay should continue. If the Governor on the advice of the Premier can name the Leader of the Opposition, then there is no reason for the delay. It is so clear. It is beyond the question of party philosophy. We know that the National Party is not even willing to accept the responsibility of running the Government and its members are sadly lacking in national appeal. This Party's philosophy has been changing with its many names, so far now that they are now separating conservatism from capitalism. The philosophy of this Party, so far as national appeal is concerned, has gone never ever to return in the history of the world where a thousand years are as little as a day in the modern concept of time and change.

I believe that I am correct in saying that all over the island the National Party canvassed and only got four seats.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is not true for the hon. junior member for St. George to come here today and say that the Barbados National Party had only placed five candidates in the election campaign. He said that we got four seats. We ran fifteen candidates. It is not true for him to say that the Bridgetown City Council is spending more money on public assistance than Montserrat gets by way of revenue. The Bridgetown City Council has 37,000 people to contend with, which is more than the whole of Montserrat. The parish of St. Michael has more people than the whole of Montserrat or even Grenada. We are considering Item 9, Leader of the Opposition. I am asking the hon. member to stick to the point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was merely giving the hon. junior member the opportunity to develop his point.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, you are kind and I am happy to continue. I think the hon. member on my right, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, has trouble with his hearing. I did not say how many members his Party ran; I pointed out the number that was necessary for a Party to win the Government. The hon. member went on to say that there are 37,000 people in St. Michael. We are not discussing that.
10.30 a.m.

All I think it is necessary to say is that we have reached this stage of knowing that the Governor of this Colony would want to consult the Premier on the matter of the Leader of the Opposition. I would like to say to the Hon. Premier that the people have sent members of the Barbados Labour Party here and if he is free to award the office of Leader of the Opposition to anyone else, we will accept it. It is a question of what the country thinks and what we will have to say during the course of this Session. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is incumbent upon me to say to Parliament what the position is in connection with the office of the Leader of the Opposition. We are toying with the greatest of all things, that is, democracy; and democracy fails to function as a democracy if it is not given its due.

You will agree with me that one can be as redundant as one elects to be. We have reached the stage where the Speaker is alleged to have stated in the newspaper that there would be no appointment, and if this is so, I do not know what the position is. The big question is that of privilege. I do not think I should accuse the Speaker of what appears in the newspaper, but in the past few days there was some talk over Rediffusion repeating what was stated in the

newspaper as the alleged statement of the Speaker of this House. For the sake of the record I have made that point and I have stated the feelings of the Barbados Labour Party through its representatives in this Committee.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that there would not be a repetition today of what went on yesterday, but it does seem to me as if the hon. junior member for St. George intends to start off in the same strain as yesterday. However, one would have to extend some sympathy to the Head of the Administration who was asked to appoint the Leader of the Opposition when, in truth and in fact, there are two Parties in this Chamber, one being a splinter group which has swollen to dimensions larger than the original plank from which it has splintered off. We now find that the original tree died by the roots, the Party went asunder by schism and I do not know whom they would like to be nominated as the hon. Leader of the Opposition, particularly when the hon. member does not know the difference between capitalism and conservatism. It would be necessary for the Leader of the Opposition to accompany the Government Members at various Conferences, and an elementary knowledge of political terms would be necessary for the Leader of the Opposition to have. Yesterday I thought I had misheard what the hon. member said about Conservatives sending money abroad, I suggest that he meant capitalists, but this morning he is making the same point. Apparently, the hon. member does not know that there are many humble people in Great Britain today who are Conservatives and who will die Conservatives. There are farmers who are Conservatives and these people always vote Conservative; there are also Trade Unionists who are Conservatives and they preach the gospel of Conservatism.

The hon. member made the point that he thought that the Barbados National Party would always be rejected by the Electorate; does the hon. member not remember that there are 37,000 voters in St. Michael and when we get single member constituencies, a policy to which the Party in power is committed, there will be at least seven seats in this constituency? Does he not remember that our candidate in that constituency received 12,000 on the last occasion? When the hon. member talks about Conservatism being rejected, the simple fact is that our Party Leader was not inclined to run a larger number of candidates. We did run 15 candidates, and those were enough, if 13 of them had been returned, to form the Government. Therefore, when the hon. member said that we had no intention of forming the Government, the hon. member is obviously mistaken. I would like the hon. member to understand that conservatism and capitalism are not interchangeable terms and if carried to its logical conclusion he might be elected as Leader of the Opposition because he is part of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City caught my eye first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was not present at the beginning of the debate, but I do not think that anybody could be so rude as to say that my Party had no intention of running or capturing the Government. As far as I am concerned, I am not worrying about who is the Leader of the Opposition. What I am more convinced about is that the Party to which the hon. member happens to belong, did not have the courage to divide the parish of St. Michael in the last Election; it is because they were afraid to do that that they lost the Election. I dared them to divide the 38,000 voters in St. Michael; they thought that the position of an hon. member who lost his seat in this constituency was impregnable. Before I shoot off my mouth, I always try to find out what the true position is.

10.40 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter for the Speaker at all, and as far as the Hon. Premier is concerned, he has nothing to do with it; he has no voice in appointing the Leader of the Opposition at all in the present situation. If the hon. member does not know that, he should at least try to find out from those who are trained in his Party who should know. In Great Britain, at least there is precedent where if the situation was different, it would be a matter for the

Speaker. I listened very carefully to the points made by my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, and when the hon. senior member for St. Peter says that the ex-Minister, the hon. junior member for St. George, has no shame, he is right, you know. Does he think that the public of Barbados no longer has the memory of three years ago? How can the hon. member get up here and talk about his Party having four seats and my Party having four seats? When my Party won nine seats in the Municipality, they hurried Adams from Trinidad. Mapp cursed the Governor and Cox cursed the Governor. Cummins refused to have anything to do with it. My Party won nine seats out of twelve and they still said that Mottley should not be Mayor, but today they have a lot of people rambling all over the Island cursing everybody.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is lucky that he got back in here, because Mr. Dowding at the last minute was told that he should not run on account of his health, despite the fact that they walked about and said that the real truth was that Dowding did not want to run under me as a Negro sitting in charge; but if he had said so, I would have told him all I knew about him. If he had made the mistake or was so drunk to tell anybody in Barbados that because I was Chairman of the Party he was not going to run, I would have told him everything I know. I know something about everybody in this country genealogically, and I am not afraid. As far as I am concerned, to blaze with the \$275 a month! We are still mindful that when the electorate gave us nine seats in Bridgetown, Adams came back here and said that he had a man-of-war in the Careenage. That is when he started turning foolish, and now he is entirely bewitched.

I heard the hon. member say in a *sotto voce* remark the other day that the present Party will only be in here for a few days, but boy, let me tell him something. (Mr. WALCOTT: Whom are you calling "boy"?) You.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I am doing, Sir. I do not know why you are listening to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I heard that when the beloved daughter of the hon. junior member for St. George was leaving to take a law course, he took her on a platform and said that she was going to be another Socialist. I do not have the courage to say that my son is going to be a Conservative. He looked at me and told me what he was going to be, but that did not mean that I should take my money back and prevent him from studying. If the hon. member does not know it, I will tell him that all the students in England have made a solemn decision that they have no use for the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. George belongs or for its Leader. Do you want me to crucify my son because he told me so? The hon. junior member for St. George can be Leader of the Opposition or anything else, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, if it so happens that the number of seats we have ties with that of the Party of the hon. member, the real thing for the hon. junior member for St. George to do, if he is so anxious to become Leader of the Opposition, is to try and persuade the ex-Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Peter whom they did everything to prevent getting back in here, to come back in the Party. They knew when they ran Hutson Williams that they wanted to put him out, and they encouraged Hutson Williams to snatch the microphone from his hand and put him to speak last when nobody would be there. (Mr. HUSBANDS: Whom is the hon. member asking the junior member for St. George to persuade to come back into the Party?) You. (Mr. HUSBANDS: Waste of time.) (Cheers).

Mr. Chairman, I sat on the other side of the House as a member of the Opposition, and I have never seen a man who was as loyal to a Party as the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I knew the hon. junior member for St. Peter long before there was a Barbados Labour Party. I knew him when he was a teacher and when it was sacrilege to throw your whole future to the wind by belonging to a Party; he was Secretary of Dr. O'Neale's Party....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is straying. I did not want to say anything, but

I think the Leader of the House should draw it to your attention, because it would look better if he drew it to your attention as I do not belong to the Party. We will get nowhere today if you allow the member to stray all over the place all the time. You have Rules and Standing Orders to keep this sort of behaviour out of the House. I do not want you to be a Sergeant Bailey, but you must try and keep hon. members, even myself, in the straight and narrow way and let us get along with the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I gave the hon. junior member for St. George quite a bit of latitude, and I am justified in giving the same to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Try and keep me in order and see how you can carry on the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I resent the implication that neither you nor myself as Leader of the House is fully aware of our responsibility as we should be. The matter under discussion is Item 9 under Head 3 — Legislature. None of them could be more anxious than we are to finalise this debate, but members, we know, are entitled to a certain amount of latitude in a matter of this sort. I quite appreciate how the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for the City feel on this matter, and therefore a certain amount of latitude has to be given to them to ventilate the issue; but we do hope that in spite of this they will make their remarks as short as possible. I can assure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I have been listening to the debate very carefully, and at no time could we have intervened to stop what has been said with any justification at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You know as well as the world, Sir, that I know my way about, and nobody knows that better than the former Chairman of this House, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. As soon as I am going too far, I look at the Chairman, bow and apologise and say what I have to say. What I am saying, however, is this: I was only suggesting that we have four members and they have four, but to me it is a matter of indifference if a Leader of the Opposition is appointed. (A VOICE: They only have three now.) From when? Do they only have three in truth?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order....

Mr. MOTTLEY: How could you be rising on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we are not to listen to asides, but the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said that we have three members, and I would like to know who are the three.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyhow, Sir, there is one thing about the debate, and it is that you never get vexed with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.
10.50 a.m.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. George said that you have only three. I would like to know from him who are the three. (A VOICE: There are only two.) Well, I would like to know from him who are the two.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. junior member for St. George wants to finalise this matter of the Leader of the Opposition, it is better for him to get the hon. junior member for St. Peter back in the fold; but I cannot see your getting him back in when he was so loyal and yet you tried to humiliate him so often as members of that Party and Sir Grantley tried to do. The thing to do is to get him back into the Party. It is no sense to fool people. I am not one who pretend to fool people. If you think by being Leader of the Opposition, you will be able to bring back into this Chamber those people whom the people put out of here, you are far mistaken. They have no chance of getting back in here. You are talking about getting young people to come into your Party. Do you think any young people are going to come into any Party with you all? You will have to get people from the Leprosarium. You may tell me that people

are not going to join my Party. You may tell me that my son is not going to join with me.

As far as I am concerned, dealing with the question of who is the Leader of the Opposition, that is a matter of indifference to me. It is a matter of the member getting \$55 a month more. Before I came into this Chamber, I started to work for my living, so what difference does it make to me? As regards a free trip to England, if I want a trip, I can give myself one. There is nobody on the Government side that can give me anything to stifle my conscience. The dictatorial attitude of the Barbados Labour Party was something which I could not stand. You may point your hand at anybody in this Island, but at no time in my whole political career can you point a finger at me, not even in 1951 when it was felt that Adult Suffrage was coming about. When it was said that I had no chance of getting into this Chamber, I was prepared to take my chance and I did so and succeeded. A lot of people would be thankful for the advice which I gave a lot of members over there.

As far as the matter of the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I have had the matter looked up. I have had experienced parliamentarians and legal luminaries to explain to me how you arrive at the person to fill the position. This is not a matter for the Speaker to decide and, as far as the Premier is concerned, it is not a matter for the Premier at all to decide. I have been hearing that the hon. junior member for St. George said that it is for the Premier to say who should be the Leader of the Opposition. In a matter of this sort, the decision lies with the Head of the Administration and he would deal with it in like manner as when my Party got nine seats in the City Council. He would take the advice of the Colonial Office in a matter of this sort.

I should never question the appointment of Leader of the Opposition. I hope the \$55 more which it carries with it would stay in the Treasury and do what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants us to do. I bet you if the position carried the same amount of money as was paid to a member, you would not have heard all this talk. I am warning members of the Government. Do not go in for making a lot of trips. Another thing, you are members of a Socialist Government and you cannot be members of a Socialist Government and want to live like Sir Winston Churchill when you know that those who put you in power are living in squalor and mud while you want to live in a \$55-suite a day. The day that you all do that, if you believe that I want to be affiliated, you will hear me then. When I come in here, do not tell me that I am playing politics. I feel that it is an honour to come in here to talk politics.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, let me just say this for the sake of the record. I made it clear, three or four times, that the person who has the prerogative of naming the Leader of the Opposition is the Governor. Never did I indicate that the responsibility lies with the Premier. The question of the money never came across my mind; I never calculated it. The big question is the principle. Whether we have one, two, three or four seats, it does not matter.

The junior member for the City in replying to me talked about conversatism. I wonder if that is something which he is bashful about. It is nothing to be ashamed of. The Conservatives did a wonderful job in this country, but they have outlived their usefulness and in this modern society, they have passed on. He is worried and when it comes to state matters, he starts rambling. Every state has its parishes.

I need say no more on this matter but to say that the question whether a thing is right or wrong is what must be observed in a society such as ours. I will give you a little illustration to prove the lack of national appeal of his Party in a society such as ours. In St. George, Mr. Dowding who is a member of his Party resigned his seat in this House on what he called the instructions of his doctor. The leader of his Party put two members of his Party to contest the elections in that constituency and Mr. Dowding spoke on three or four platforms in support of those candidates. Neither won a seat; so that proves more or less that the reason why Mr. Dowding was elected a member of this House in that constituency was more or less because of the individual and not because of national appeal of that Party.

As a matter of fact, both of those candidates left their deposits in the Treasury. The hon. member talks about what happened in St. Michael. That question is linked up with the \$1 1/2 million or more that is spent in poor relief. This is about the third time that hon. member rose on his feet. I repeat, the Conservatives have nothing to be ashamed of. In their day they put up a group of candidates and they were thrown down by Sir Grantley Adams and his Party and they were satisfied. It is nothing whether I stand alone. I have nothing to be afraid about.

11 a.m.

The Hon. Leader of the House will be free to speak. If he is going to direct the Chair I do not know what we are coming to. If I stand alone as the Barbados Labour Party, we will survive. I have nothing to be afraid of. There is something which I fear; I fear that what the Hon. Leader of the House is doing will lead to one thing and that is a dictatorship. I hope that I shall not have to say anything further on this point.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, we are considering Item 9, "Leader of the Opposition", under this Head. I have heard a lot of expressions as to the Leader of the Opposition but we are now considering the vote of the money. This House has no power to appoint the Leader of the Opposition and therefore all that has been said on this matter is futile. If I were listening to an argument that the vote in respect of this item should be rescinded or amended, that would have been a different matter; but this is a waste of time because we have no power to appoint the Leader of the Opposition. It does not become me to carry on such a debate.

I am not opposed to Item 26 "Speaker's Travelling Allowance"; I am not criticising the vote at all. Listening to the remarks which were made yesterday, I intended there and then to speak on this item if the opportunity had been afforded me to do so. I am now going to say what I wanted to say yesterday. I am not speaking on the item for the purpose of making any criticism of the vote, but reference was made by my colleague to remarks which were made on the 5th May, 1959, in respect of the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Bill. I heard the hon. member say that something was being cooked up and I hope that I am quoting him correctly. I know what transpired before that. It was this; I was approached by the then Government and I was told that in their opinion the time had come when the office of Speaker should be divorced from any ordinary occupation, that it should be a question of one man doing one job. The observation was also made that the remuneration of the Speaker of the House of Assembly of Barbados did not compare very favourably with that of the Speakers of the Chambers of Trinidad and Jamaica and, to some extent, British Guiana. Information was obtained, as far as I remember, and I know I remember correctly, because only yesterday I read the speech of the present Speaker of this House who was then the Leader of the Democratic Labour Party. The hon. junior member for Christ Church was then Leader of the Barbados National Party. I know that nothing was cooked up because the Leaders of the three Parties discussed the matter and the Leaders of those Parties had conversations with me about it. I do not know if my colleague had been left out of any of the discussions with the Premier; it may be that he was left out. The then Premier came to me on that occasion; I would not be a party to anything which could be cooked up; I would never be a party to anything like that. It was with the express understanding that I should resign my job as an active official in the Trade Union in order to continue as Speaker under the present conditions. Hence, in that connection, I wrote a letter last year to the Leaders of the respective Parties and even to the sole independent in the House of Assembly. I was not ashamed to write that letter; I knew what understanding had been reached. As a matter of fact, one of the Leaders of the Party was over anxious that I should resign.

Mr. Chairman, I did not like the expression of my colleague when he said that something was cooked up by the Government. I was not suspicious of anything having been cooked up. As to the manner of my approach to members of the Parties, I did not think that any of the discussions could give any impression that there was anything being cooked up. As I say, I would not be a party to anything which would

be cooked up. It was an open understanding and I am quite sure that there are some members of this House who will remember that and who also remember the circumstances. I should like to be fair to everybody, notwithstanding that conditions have become estranged between myself and an individual or between myself and a member of a political party. Whatever has been the truth is the truth; I do not have, I would never have, to labour or try to oppose what was true.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not speak on this matter yesterday....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member introducing another matter or is he speaking on this item?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the matter on which the hon. member who has just sat down spoke. As to the office of Speaker, what I understand is that at no time was any legislation passed in this House in which the job of Speaker was amended from a part-time job to a whole-time one. The hon. senior member for St. Michael at that time, on the floor of the House, said that one of the best reasons for the amendment was that the job would be a whole-time job. I recall yesterday what was said in this House and I was worrying last night over whether legislation had been passed saying that the office of Speaker was to be a whole-time office. I am saying that there was no such legislation passed in here. During the debate on the Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act with particular reference to increasing the salary of the Speaker, it was said by the hon. senior member for St. Michael that the office of the Speaker would be a whole-time office; but never at any time any legislation passed saying that the job would be a whole-time one.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly sure that the Leader of the hon. member's Party can remember that there was a distinct understanding that I would be resigning the Trade Union job.

11.10 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not saying that it is not so, but I am saying that there was no legislation here making the office of Speaker a whole-time job. If the hon. member asks me to say whether I remember that it was said that he should retire from the Union, I would say "yes"; but there was no legislation saying that his office should be whole time, and I am sure the hon. member will agree with that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: There is nothing in the Act that says that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, both hon. members know that this item is fixed by Law and you cannot have an interminable debate on an item fixed by Law.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, dealing with this matter, Item 26 remains fixed by Law, but there is a motion before the House to increase this amount; so even if it is fixed by Law, you are asking for the amount to be increased and you will have to accept debate on it. It is not for me to determine that; it is for the Chairman. Yesterday when the hon. junior member for St. George was speaking, he queried increasing the Speaker's vote, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter, my colleague, spoke the truth. I do not believe I am one of those men who are afraid of the truth; but what both the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City said emphasised the cooked-up argument. I challenge the hon. senior member for the City to produce a debate in which it was stated that the Speakership was going to be a whole-time job. When the Labour Party was in power, members believed they were in power for life and were always willing to accommodate them. If the leaders of the two Parties then in the House went and sat down around the Table to accommodate a situation or person, that is their business, but it is no business of Parliament. We never agreed in here that the Speakership would be a whole-time job; it was a bogus arrangement, because when the same leaders had to face an election in 1961, the same Party of which the hon. junior member for St. Peter was a member wanted to make other arrangements; therefore they would not have disagreed on the basis that the Party wanted to do

it. They had no objection to increasing the Speaker's salary at that time from \$400, because the Speaker's salary at that time was \$400 a month.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, if you look in the Estimates before 1959, you will see the amount set out there. Do you think they could add \$200 to that and make it a whole-time job? What kind of man would take that as a whole-time job at another \$200 a month? They could only offer that to the hon. junior member for St. Peter because they were willing to accommodate him in laziness, and only a lazy man would accept \$200 a month more for the Speakership as a whole-time job, come here and sit once a week and during the rest of the time he is blowing a comb. What would he do the other five days of the week; walk about town and interfere with people?

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, the idea of increasing the Speaker's salary did not emanate from me. The hon. member said this was to accommodate a lazy man. It did not come from me; so I was not seeking to be a lazy man and I want that put right in the hon. member's mind. I want the hon. member to realise that all Parties then concerned made it a condition that I would have to resign the Trade Union job. That, too, did not come from me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will put it this way. Only a lazy man would want to give up a job to accept a job that is \$400 a month plus all the time you have to do another job, because somebody is going to offer you a job at \$200 a month more. Only a lazy man would accept those conditions, because it would be downright laziness to be placed in a position where the Speaker got \$400 prior to 1959 while Dr. Cummins was Speaker and still practised at his profession. If you want to know more, the reason why they asked the hon. junior member for St. Peter to give up his job at the Union was because the former hon. junior member for St. Joseph at the time was catching hell, and they wanted the ex-Speaker to accommodate him so that he could become an Assistant Secretary of the Union as a long range measure of getting at me, and some of the very people met at a shop in Eagle Hall and arranged all these things in order that Mr. Straughn would be nominated as an Assistant Secretary of the Union.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I know of absolutely no plot nor did I take part in any plot to have the ex-junior member for St. Joseph put into the place of an Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. I never associated myself with any such plot, and I feel sure, too, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that I do not think in his better judgement that he really associates me with being a party to a plot to have the then junior member for St. Joseph foisted on the Trade Union as an official. There may have been a plot, but I was never any party to it. I never had any discussion at all with the then junior member for St. Joseph as to his preferment or acceptance as an official of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, those are not points of order. If I say something and an hon. member objects, when I sit down he can get up and make a speech. I warned the Minister of Trade last week to adjourn until Wednesday; so nobody need tell me anything today about prolonging a debate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made reference to me. All I said was that this debate has nothing to do with a row at the Workers' Union, and I am not going to allow the business of the House to be held up the entire day discussing the Union's affairs.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have to discuss them,.....

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Is everybody going to rise on a point of order?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House just drew your attention to the question of straying. Just now when I drew the matter to your attention, the Leader of the House said that you had to give members some latitude; so you have to give them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yesterday you got in here and talked a bunch of ignorance instead of marshalling your facts. Something has been said in this Chamber which I have a right to speak on, and it is that the Speakership of the House was made a whole-time job. I am not going to sit down here and hear any nonsense being trotted out at this stage. The hon. junior member for St. George and his Party cooked up arrangements in order to carry the Speakership to \$600 a month, because nothing had taken place with members' emoluments in the House generally. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was offered the Speakership as a whole-time job because somebody did not want him to be Assistant Secretary of the Trade Union, and you heard the hon. member say that when he was offered the post he was told that he would have to resign from the Union. By whom was he told? By this House? He was told by the then Government in power. The hon. member was told by the Government that to become Speaker of the House that is what he would have to do and they were going to make the job \$600 a month.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall not be tolerating any more points of order unnecessarily.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think you know how much you have said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said "unnecessarily".
11.20 a.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is not "unnecessarily." The hon. member said that I may want more. The hon. member must remember that it was not just the Government Party that made the condition of my having to resign the Trade Union, but it was also consequent upon the decision of the three Parties which then constituted the House — not one Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: Those are not points of order; those are points of fact. If he says that it is not a fact, well then, I cannot say he said that; so it is no point his getting up on a point of order. He has a right to disagree with it. I am saying that the former hon. junior member for St. Peter, the former Speaker, could not make privately any arrangement with the Government and say that it originated in the House. All that cooked-up arrangement was done outside of this House; it was not done in here. What was done in here was to change the salary of the Speaker from \$400 to \$600 a month without any apron strings attached to it.

My colleague said that he was called upon and was approached to give up his job. That is his business. The events which happened subsequently proved that it was nothing done by Parliament. They put somebody to run in my constituency against me, and the same Party ignored his protestations about what he is now alleging to have been done by them. If the hon. member says that the question of Speakership being a whole-time job was done in a debate in this House, I am saying that there are no debates that carry anything of the Speakership being a whole-time job. I repeat that it was a cooked-up job. The date of resignation of the hon. member would show how it was a cooked-up arrangement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is perfectly right in saying what he said the former senior member for St. Michael said in here; but I do not know if he said that opposition was raised. I believe opposition was made by the Hon. Minister of Trade. The then Leader of the House said that the reason why the salary was raised was because it was going to become a whole-time job; but there was no bill before us to tell us that it was a whole-time job.

Mr. WALCOTT: There was no debate in here to show that it was going to be a whole-time, part-time, or any sort of job. All you said was that you were going to give the Speaker then \$200 more because of the person who was then in the Chair. They had this cooked-up arrangement to suit the person for whom they were making the job. If the hon. member said that they called upon him to give up his job, well then, it served him right. I say that the then Government was looking for stooges and that is why they could

have come to offer somebody that. Do you think that they could have offered me something like that and ask me to give up the job which I had at the Union?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Item 26, I do not like this cat and mouse game. This is a cat and mouse game. When a cat holds a mouse, he plays with it for a considerable time before he kills it, and sometimes the mouse gets away; but it is the intention of the cat to kill the mouse although he plays with it before he kills it.

Under this Head, you will notice that they have reduced the Speaker's emoluments by \$1,200. It is the policy of the present Government or the Hon. Premier to do some pruning. It is your policy to cut. You are cutting the cloth to suit the man. You are trying to save money and you have cut down the Speaker's emoluments one way and raised it another way. That is why I call it a cat and mouse game. You have told me that you are saving money and you are using the knife and that we must tighten our belts, but yet you are carrying it up somewhere else. I cannot understand this game; it is causing me grave doubts. You are cutting and increasing too. Your knife is sharp at one end and you cut easily; but when it comes to another paragraph, you seem to turn the knife on the back. In this case, you have reduced the salary by \$1,200 and then you have raised the travelling allowance by \$360.

In my opinion, I think you have done a better job for the Speakership, because this particular increase does not carry any income tax. The Government will not get a berry from this because you do not pay income tax on travelling allowance.

I cannot understand this job at all because you only pay for one's travelling after one gets on the job. You do not pay to leave home to come to the job. For what are you paying travelling allowance? You say that you are cutting. Your policy is to cut; but the very thing which you should cut, you have increased. I only want the public to know that nobody can fool me. This is playing with me. I cannot find out for the life of me why it is that you give \$90 a month for travelling to a Minister, Speaker, or anybody.
11.30 a.m.

I may say that this amount of \$90.00 a month for travelling is quite a lot of money and at the rate of 28 cents per mile that would mean about 400 odd miles would have to be travelled in order to earn this Travelling Allowance. You are creating a grievance among the members of the Civil Service because the Civil Servants will be paid at the rate of 28 cents per mile for the first 200 miles and then it all ends up at 12 cents a mile.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has suddenly become very wise in many things. It was distinctly said by the Hon. Minister of Finance that the travelling allowance for the Speaker had been raised to the same figure as the travelling allowance for a Minister. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not have one single word to say when the travelling allowance was increased to this point by his Government. He did not say anything about the adverse effect it would have either on the members of the Civil Service or anybody else. Why then suddenly today does he find it so important to compare the travelling allowance for the Ministers with that of the Civil Servants?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has spoken about the last Government, but the last Government did not talk about any draw-your-belt policy or anything like that; the last Government did not use any knife at all. It did not appear that the last Government had a knife at all, but this present Government is using the knife. I quite agree with them for using the knife but I do not agree with them for using the knife on (a) and not on (b). Does the Hon. Minister want me to look ridiculous today? This is a draw-the-belt policy or the starve-the-dog policy. Whether it is His Honour the Speaker or a Minister, you have the show me the ball which shot Nelson in order to convince me that either the Speaker or the Minister could do all of this travelling, if you are tightening your belt or if you are cutting your cloth to suit the measure. If you are cutting, then you must cut;

and if you are not cutting, then you should not cut. I would like to see the justification for paying this travelling allowance.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister caught my eye first.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is saying that a Civil Servant who is drawing so much a mile for travelling allowance would have to do a lot of travelling so as to spend as much as \$90.00 a month on travelling. Well, let the hon. member go and find that out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that for a Minister to draw \$90.00 a month for travelling allowance, to convince him of that, you would have to show him the ball that shot Nelson. I should like to say that the hon. member was a member of the Party which formed the last Government which put the travelling allowance for Ministers at that figure, and, at least, this Government is saving the taxpayers \$720.00 a year. I really cannot understand the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who was a member of the Party which brought forward the payment of a travelling allowance for the Speaker. All that this Government is saying is that they are taking away \$1,200.00 a year from the salary of His Honour the Speaker, but they are making the travelling allowance the same as that for a Minister. How can the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that he has to be shown the ball which shot Nelson to convince him that this allowance of \$90.00 a month could be used? The hon. member did not say that when the members of the Labour Party, the members of the last Government, brought in that allowance for the Ministers. Quite honestly, I believe that the Ex-Speaker knew nothing about this cooking up; I did not want to reveal what I am going to say now, but it is a fact that the last Government engineered what they considered to be a whole-time job for the Speaker, but he did not know it. The whole idea was that the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was a renegade, would not be controlled by the Party — you can publish this in Gath — and there was the desire to get the Speaker to name him. (Mr. WALCOTT: I was the junior member in 1956.) I am sorry. However, the view was expressed that the Speaker could not name the hon. member while the Speaker was an understudy at the Barbados Workers' Union, and therefore you would put him out of the Trade Union and then he would get a chance at naming the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to stick to this item.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that those are the facts.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The result of the plan....

Mr. MOTTLEY: The whole bunch of them were so corrupt that you did not know whom you could trust. I can afford to speak because I took two and a half hours in here defending your position because I thought that you were badly treated by the then Premier. They wanted to appoint Straughn at the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going back on the matter relative to the Speaker, because I said what I had to say already; but when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph says that he is not agreeing with the payment of \$90.00 a month for a Minister's travelling allowance, it was that same hon. member who voted for that payment when it was put to the vote on the last occasion. He is a monumental hypocrite to say that he would not vote for this allowance because he would have to be shown the ball which shot Nelson to be convinced that this could be right. Mr. Chairman, the debates of this House will prove who voted for this payment when it was put to the vote. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph voted for this allowance in 1958-59; if the hon. member wants to break the rule, which he is incapable of doing, he would have to oppose the Party which was convincingly voted into power. Now the hon. member is like King Canute; he wants to push back the tide. The hon. member has forgotten what was said here in 1958. The salary of the Speaker was \$4,800.00 a year; that was done so as to make Dr. Cummins the Speaker. Up went the salary when Dr. Cummins came in.
11.40 a.m.

The salary before was \$2,880 with no travelling. When the change was made and the hon. junior member for St. Peter became Speaker, the salary came up to the present level with a travelling allowance of \$720. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was Deputy Speaker and was drawing an extra allowance; yet he is asking me to show him the ball that shot Nelson.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I know the hon. member is trying to make himself heard by the people, but I never drew anything extra as Deputy Speaker. If he wants to twist things and do as he likes, he can; but I never got an increase. Why is he trying to lie on me? My shoulders are broad and I can fight in here or outside, physically or otherwise. I would give the first cuff if he wants it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Imagine that, Mr. Chairman! The hon. member resembles something not human when he sets up his face like that. If he wants to resort to physical violence, it shows that he is incompetent to be in here, because in here is where we have a battle of words; and if his vocabulary is so limited that he cannot find proper language to deal with me in a debate, I would not resort to fighting with him. The days for that are over with me; but when this monumental idiot we have as a member says that he did not draw an extra allowance, he does not know that he was sitting in the House of Assembly as Deputy Speaker, and at that time this was the position: in 1958-59 the Speaker received \$4,800 and the Deputy Speaker received \$3,000; so when ordinary members were getting \$200 a month, he was getting \$50 a month more. This idiot does not know.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, that was fixed when we were fixing salaries as a whole. When they made an increase to the Speaker's salary, nothing was done to the Deputy Speaker's salary; so how can you call that extra?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter means that the Deputy Speaker gets more than an ordinary member.

Mr. WALCOTT: He would not understand that.

Mr. SMITH: But you would not call that extra. Extra is when you are given travelling allowance or anything of the sort; but you were fixing salaries.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you see the sort of mentality you have to deal with. The Speaker's salary was increased from \$2,880 to \$4,800 and hon. members voted for that. When it went from \$4,800 to \$600 a month, the hon. member voted for that with allowances, and I pointed out that the Deputy Speaker got more money too than ordinary members, and the position is the same today. Now the hon. member is saying that we would have to show him the ball that shot Nelson for him to vote for \$90 a month for travelling when Civil Servants only get 28 cents a mile. When the idea was brought here to increase the travelling from \$60 to \$90, hon. members criticised it, and the hon. member voted for it. Only an Ananias would come back here and pretend he was always against the idea of giving more money to these people; and what does he do in the end? He is challenging somebody to physical violence by saying that he would give the first cuff. I ignore that challenge completely, because so far as he is concerned, he would be, in colloquial terms, purely gallows bait, and I have no intention of ending my day on that pinnacle with anything like him.

What shocked me, Mr. Chairman, was to hear the hon. member who is so enthusiastic to criticise the Government and so anxious to make the idea odious, say that I wanted somebody to hear me. People heard me against the Party to which he belongs and returned me in here, and people want to hear me now; they do not want to hear him with that nonsense he carries on with, and if he carries that outside of here he would see what audience he would get in trying to criticise a Government which has reduced the total emoluments of the Speaker. Before he comes here and sees that this is a reduction of the total emoluments, he is coming here pretending that the Government is not using the knife and that they are giving the Speaker more money. The total emoluments of the Speaker's Office have been reduced and everybody can see it if they can subtract, but the hon.

member is making a row about that. You reduce the amount at one point by \$100 a month and increase it at another point by \$30, and the net reduction is \$70 a month which is \$840 a year. The Government is reducing the Speaker's emoluments by \$840 a year, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has the effrontery to say that they are giving up in one place but not in another. It is purely a question that he did not stay in school long enough.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind what the hon. member says, because a person can say whatever comes to his mouth. He said that I said you would have to show me the ball that shot Nelson to vote for this, but I said that you would have to show me the ball that shot Nelson to convince me that this amount of travelling is being done. The hon. member is so accustomed to attacking that one of these days he is going to attack himself. Well, the others have gone now; I am here and he sits there and waits to attack those who remain. He does not have the votes of this country; otherwise none of us would be in here; I believe he would be here alone. All the hypocrite, all the monumental idiot and all that he calls me, is his business. I can call him something too, but I would not sink to the gutter with him now. If he continues, however, to worry me, I will tell him something, and it is true.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 11 - Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant. For many years I have been asking that in keeping with the dignity of this House the Deputy Marshal and Messenger be made to wear a uniform. It is traditional and customary in all Parliaments for this to be done. It is now over eight years that the gentleman was in the office, and they have not seen fit to provide him with a uniform. I would like to hear the Hon. Leader of the House on this matter as to whether it is proposed to be done.
11.50 a.m.

I am asking about uniform for the Messenger of the House; I am not asking about salaries. I am dealing with Item 11 and I am also dealing with the amplifying equipment.

It is not in keeping with the dignity of the House that the Messenger should have come in to the Marshal or the Clerk in any type of suit. I believe that the Hon. Minister of Education will tell you that the Deputy Marshal should be wearing uniform and I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to tell us what they are doing about it.

Dealing with the amplifying set, I see the sum of \$5,000 is voted. I think we have reached the stage when we should have a proper set because what is in use now is not the type of equipment to be used here at all. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me what changes they propose to make about it. The type of set which should be used in here is one which is set in the walls. That is the type which I see in the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, this amplifying equipment which is in use here is cumbersome and antiquated. Along with that, it is very ineffective. It is true to say that in this Chamber here are many members who generate more heat than light, and that may have had some effect on the microphones in the past. Perhaps, that may have injured the delicate mechanism in the microphones. However, we do think that this type of antiquated equipment should be done away with and proper microphones installed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, in reply to the last hon. member who spoke, this equipment has only been recently installed. Considering the money which it costs to install, we can make no promise that we are going to replace it in the near future.

In the Estimates, provision is made for its maintenance and operation. It would certainly have to remain for some time further before we can replace it.

As regards the point made by the hon. senior member for the City about uniform for the Messenger, this is a matter which is engaging, as far as I understand, the attention of the Speaker.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has queried the travelling allowance for the Speaker and the fact that while his substantive remuneration has been decreased, his travelling allowance has been increased. The fact is that, faced with a decrease in salary of \$100 a month, His Honour the Speaker pointed out that his travelling is almost the same as a Minister in the sense that he is called upon to attend almost all the official functions which Ministers are called upon to attend and to be present at every official engagement at which Ministers are expected to put in their appearance; and if then we were going to decrease his salary, some attempt should be made to offset it in some way or the other. But the net result is that he is now drawing a salary of \$840 a year less.

On the point made by the hon. junior member for St. George as regards the absence of a Leader of the Opposition, I think a matter like this must be of some concern to both the Opposition Parties in this Assembly, not as to the emoluments involved because I am sure that either in the case of the Barbados Labour Party or the Barbados National Party, the Leader of the Opposition would do with the extra emoluments paid to him what the former Leader of the Opposition did. The former Leader of the Opposition did not give to himself the extra emolument but devoted it to Party funds.

I think I heard the hon. junior member for St. George say that we are in some way responsible for the failure to appoint a Leader of the Opposition. There are two points. The title of Leader of the Opposition normally goes to the largest Party outside of the Government. Both Parties were elected, one with five and one with four; and shortly after the elections one member of the Barbados Labour Party resigned, leaving both Parties with the same number of seats; therefore, it is obviously no easy matter to declare which of them is entitled to be called the Opposition Party.

What really surprised me was to hear the hon. junior member for St. George emphasise that one of the reasons was because the Party was expected to assume the Government in the case the Government resigned, which is quite true; but is he saying that his Party can take over the Government? If we resign, no single Party can take over and we would have to go to the country. In any case, we fully appreciate the fact that the largest Party outside the Government should be designated the Opposition Party and we have gone further and made statutory recognition to the effect that we are in agreement with the appointment of an Opposition Party because it actually increases the salary of the Opposition Leader by law. As soon as His Excellency the Governor can resolve in his mind the doubts occasioned by the parties' numerical strength in this Chamber, then the matter would be resolved one way or the other.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, further to what the Hon. Minister of Trade has said — I really did not hear the points raised by hon. members on the other side about the appointment of Leader of the Opposition — it appears to me that if the criterion was applied which the Hon. Minister of Trade said about the Opposition being able to take over the Government, I doubt very much whether it would be more than a party of one so far as the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. George belongs. But quite apart from that, in the 1952 Act of the United Kingdom there is a statutory provision for the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition and that authority is vested in the Speaker of the House of Commons; but in Barbados by the Act of 1949, Chapter 29, it states that the Governor shall indicate the person whom he thinks is entitled to receive the salary as Leader of the Opposition. That is an entirely different matter altogether and in a situation in which you have the two parties in the Opposition having the same number of members, the task of the Officer administering the Colony is not an easy one and you have put him in an extremely awkward position when those two parties are not agreed on recommending who should receive the salary of Leader of the Opposition.

12.00 noon.

I think it would be invidious in these circumstances for an Officer administering the Government of this country to make such a selection. We all have our personal views

as to the ability of any of the Parties over there to form a Government; but that is not for us. If the Parties got together and said: "We would like Mr. So and So to be the Leader of the Opposition, one of us has got to be the Leader of the Opposition", if either by ballot or by bullet or any other method of selection they decided that such and such a person should be recognised as the Leader of the Opposition, then I am sure that the Governor would pay some heed to that. In the United Kingdom there are usually two strong Parties and the third Party is gaining strength — that is, the Liberal Party — and in these circumstances there is no difficulty because there is the question of arithmetic. But here in this island it is the feeling of one hon. member that he is the Leader of a Party which did not even contest the Local Government elections. In the first analysis, it is a question of arithmetic and all things being equal, it is a question of paying money out of the Treasury unnecessarily.

Mr. Chairman, it is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money to say that because a member of a Party feels that he should be the Leader of the Opposition, money should be paid to him. Various fallacious arguments have been advanced in this connection. I have read in the Press that the Barbados Labour Party received more votes than the Party which is running the Government; but in every election, whether it is in the United States of America or in the United Kingdom, the Party which loses receives more votes than the Party which gets into power. If you run 22 candidates and you get in four and one half (*Laughter*), and the Government runs sixteen candidates and gets in fourteen of those candidates, are you going to say that you should be the Government because you got 49 votes and the other people got 700? (Mr. WALCOTT: You have thirteen and one half.) We really have fourteen and three quarters, but fourteen and seven eighths would be more correct. (*Laughter*). This kind of argument is too puerile; if you were to study the election statistics in any part of the world, depending upon the people who turn out to vote, you may get a candidate losing with 7,000 votes and you may get another getting in with 1,500 votes; but it does not mean that the constituents did not vote for the man who got 7,000 votes. The other people ran the essential minimum of candidates in order to show that they are serious and resourceful and then you say that you got more votes? That is the most ridiculous argument which I have ever heard in my life. In any event, the Government could indicate but it is a question of receiving a salary. This is what the Act says:—

"The Member for the time being recognized by the Governor as Leader of the Opposition shall, so long as he continues to be recognized as such by the Governor be entitled to receive salary....."

It goes on to say that he shall receive salary at such and such a rate.

But whom are you going to recognise and on what basis? On the basis of the fallacious argument that more people supported the Party who got four seats than those who supported the Party that has got the Government? I want to say that the Opposition is neither recognized or recognizable. Up to yesterday the members of that Party got up and each one of them has put his point of view. They manage to find four sides on each and every single question which comes before the House. They have four different sides to take and we do not know whether they are a rectangle, a parallelogram or a rhombus; it is very difficult to understand the position sometimes. I know that they are not a square, although they may be four squares. That situation will resolve itself in the process of time and therefore we should not worry about that matter. Do not let the hon. junior member for St. George beat a drum because we may be suspicious about his motives.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was reluctant to speak again, but the Premier may be unaware of his lack of responsibility as Premier of this country. Perhaps he is not aware of the necessity of a Leader of the Opposition or he may think it unnecessary to have an Opposition. If he thinks that it is unnecessary to have an Opposition, well, let him think so; but that would be cutting across the fundamental principles of democracy. If I am alone as a member

of the Barbados Labour Party and the Premier thinks that it is necessary to appoint a Leader of the Opposition from the Barbados National Party, well, let him do that. He knows that it is the prerogative of the Governor to do that. When the Premier referred to England, it is not accurate to say what he said obtains in the House of Commons where there were equal numbers of the two different Parties of the Opposition. It was not a question of deciding which of the groups would be the Leader of the Opposition; an amendment was made giving the authority to the Speaker of the House in order that the matter may be settled in the House. 12.10 p.m.

All I have said and am prepared to say and maybe repeat is that if you think it may unduly cause some embarrassment to the Officer administering this country, you should do exactly what was done in the United Kingdom; but to say that it is beyond the Premier to discern an Opposition is to say that we do not want an Opposition. I think the Premier has some sense of responsibility to a country like this. It is not whether or not you select me; I have made no appeal for the position. I am nothing to do with the money, but the question of the salary applies to every sponsor. Why is the Premier of this country by legislation enjoying a better salary than his Ministers? Is it only because he is called "Premier"? The same thing obtained with the Leader of the Opposition and the Chairman of Committees. They get more than the rank and file members of the House. It is shocking to feel that we will come to this unusual and ugly pass that a Premier of this colony saddled with the responsibility of a quarter of a million souls can come in this House today and say an Opposition is not discernible. It is not a question of whether we have one, two or three members, and if he thinks we are less than 4 1/2 members, does he refer to the hon. junior member for St. Peter as half of a man? It reminds me of a man standing above the hold of a ship where there are seven men below and asking to send up half the men. Imagine the hon. member referring to my worthy friend as seven-eighths of a member! What are we drifting to in this Parliament?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier never referred to the hon. member as half of a man.

Mr. MILLER: He started with three-quarters and then moved him up by progression to seven-eighths.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I never designated any single member. It may be the member for St. George, judging from his speech yesterday. It may be the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Hon. Premier referred to the hon. member for St. Joseph, and I would like to know to which member he is referring.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: According to the statements made yesterday by the hon. junior member for St. George, it could have been the hon. senior member for the City, because he accused the member for the City of belonging to this Party; so if I say four and seven-eighths it could apply to anybody or it could have been a combination of three and three-quarters and one-eighth! It may be accumulated in that fashion.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is a question of principle. You can toy with the approach to a principle, but you never destroy it. The Premier with a sense of responsibility in a community such as ours said today that indications are that he is not concerned with an Opposition. Maybe he does not want an Opposition. If the Premier or the Governor wishes that A, B, or C should be appointed, he should appoint him; and when he talks about the money, that is only folly. There is time for comedy wherever we go today, but not in a Chamber like this with its ancient tradition. The time for comedy is long outmoded.

Mr. Chairman, this must go on record. The Premier can use his influence. It does not matter who is appointed

Leader of the Opposition; we are not concerned with the \$12 or \$13 extra per week, because you cannot pay a scavenger that and that could not operate in the mind of a member of a Party. But certainly we want to observe a principle. If it is necessary to make an amendment to the Act as was done in the United Kingdom removing the responsibility from the Governor to the Speaker of the House, do it quickly; but what do you expect from a thinking world on its examination of what is taking place in Barbados? Is this Cuba where you name a member of the Opposition and make sure that you nullify his function and his effect in Parliament? Certainly this is not the desire of the Premier. Need I stay on this any longer? It is a question of principle which you cannot change. You may perform all the gymnastics, you may even play comedy, but you can only toy with the approach to the principle, because it must remain; and whatever the decision is going to be, whether or not it is necessary to amend the Act giving the Speaker the responsibility to appoint somebody, you should appoint a Leader of the Opposition.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, it does not matter about the money. I do not know if it would have any appeal. I am not making an appeal for myself either. But I feel that my Party whether it be one or two or four and a half should be in Opposition, and I hope we have concluded the debate on this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to ask the hon. member if he were in the position of the Governor of this country — and perhaps the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would like to express his opinion also — whom he would appoint as Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would indicate, as I do not see any other members of their Party, whom they would appoint. That would help us solve the problem.

Mr. MILLER: That is the type of sarcasm that is doing harm and damage to the members of this Parliament. It is reducing this to a farce and a joke. When my Party decided that I should lead the Opposition, before the motion was put I was at pains to explain that I would only accept it if there was a unanimous decision by all the members of the Council.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, do I understand that his Party has appointed him as Leader of the Opposition? Then there is no further argument; he is Leader here.

Mr. MILLER: The Premier is making sport at this business. He is lacking in the serious responsibility and statesmanship of running a country like this, and all through his efforts in Parliament he has been engaged in this cardinal sin which has been repeated over and over. If he is going to reduce this to a farce or joke, all that remains for him to do is to surrender his responsibility to this country. I am not saying that my Party appointed me. There must be something sinister if he has said all he had to say on this decision. There is a principle to be observed. Our Party accepted its defeat because it was the decision of the electorate; but if in every debate and discussion you talk about the Labour Party and the ex-Government, you can create a lot of sympathy for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what Item is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on Item 6.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you are not addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: You know my unchanging respect for the Chair and my appreciation of the manner in which you fill that Chair. But, Mr. Premier, I must ask you to take a more serious view of the matter. You are capable of laughter and a spot of fun, but when you are dealing with a country, you have to be serious. 12.20 p.m.

I am making no appeal for myself, but it should be done. That is all I am saying.

The question that the sum of \$44,613 under Head 3, Legislature, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 4 - AUDITOR GENERAL

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,450 under Head 4, Auditor General, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 5 - JUDICIARY

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$69,410 under Head 5, Judiciary, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 6 - LEGAL

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$3,780 under Head 6, Legal, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 7 - REGISTRATION

Head 7 - Registration - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under Head 7, which is on page 16, Item 10, Clerical Assistance, the note to the Item should read: "Reimbursement to revenue approximately \$24,000." There is a slight mistake in the figures of the note.

I beg to move that the sum of \$32,158 under Head 7, Registration, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 15, Books for recording deeds. Is it not time we consider the use of microfilming in the recording of these deeds and the photographing of certificates? All that is done in certain other West Indian communities. I wonder what Government has to say on that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am entirely in agreement with the hon. member whether it be done by copying machines or microfilm. I think the present method is tedious and a waste of time, and hon. members who have been in here previously would know that His Honour the Speaker and I, principally, have been asking that the present method should be changed to something more modernistic. We had an archivist here during the past eighteen months and I think he has made some recommendations to the Government. As to the method which would be used for recording and duplicating documents I cannot say just now. But obviously we could not change the system in a matter of six weeks and therefore we had to vote for the present method to continue until the time that we have formulated plans for the speeding up of getting documents out of the Registry. I have had the experience of seeing people going into the Registry for two weeks just to get a certificate. It would be better even if it meant paying 50 cents instead of 24 cents and your getting the document more quickly. I would like to assure hon. members that the Government has this matter actively under consideration.

The question that the sum of \$32,158, under Head 7, Registration, do now stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 - CROWN SOLICITOR

Head 8 - Crown Solicitor - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,400, under Head 8, Crown Solicitor, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under this Head which is on page 20, Item 14, Furniture and Office Equipment, the word "pine" should be deleted before the word "desk", in the explanatory note.

I beg to move that the sum of \$964, under Head 9, Ministry of Finance, do now stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$51,781, under Head 10, Accountant General, do now stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,491,189, under Head 11, Pensions, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 12 - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$2,242,344, under Head 12, Charges of Debt, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS

Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the sum of \$46,738, under Head 13, Customs, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 12, Overtime, for which the sum of \$15,000 is to be voted. The note says: "Overtime fees to staff. Not recoverable". Will the Hon. Premier tell me a little bit more about this? Will the Hon. Premier explain why this is not recoverable? 12.30 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, while the Hon. Minister is looking for the information on that matter, I would also like to ask him if the time has not come when some attention should be paid to the building where the liquor is kept in bond; I mean the one on the Wharf. It is old, it is inad-

quate for storage, and even the merchants have to call for periods of time before they can get their liquor transferred from the sheds to the warehouse. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs, and while the matter is under consideration, it might be wise for the Government to pay attention as to whether or not a new building should be erected at the area as a spirit bond.

I know that opinion is divided on that because most of the businesses are in Broad Street and it is easier to pass a warrant there and get your liquor out of the spirit bond. However, the Deep Water Harbour is not far away. I would like the Minister in charge to take up this matter with the Customs Authorities and see if what I am saying is not a fact. They need more room for the storage of spirits in bond, whisky, gin and so on, and the inconvenience of merchants not being able to transfer their commodities from the transit shed to the spirit bond causes a delay of a week or two.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, as far as the question asked by the hon. senior member for the City is concerned, that is in respect of Item 12, "Overtime", I should like to say that when goods are being landed, overtime is paid by the agents of imports; but when people are working at the Baggage Warehouse, that is what this overtime is for and not for the importation of goods. When the bond houses are bonding the goods, that is normally paid for. I remember some three or four years ago the hon. member asking questions about overtime because what a man collected in overtime was less than what had been paid out. I believe that that situation has been rectified.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, in a country where unemployment is so rife, perhaps this \$15,000 might have been utilised in employing a few youths who have just left school.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In answer to that question, I should like to say that it is a matter as to whether it is desirable or expedient for other people to be paid this overtime, because after a certain time there will be a clamour for them to be taken over to the permanent staff where there will also be a clamour for pension rights. Certain offices carry certain privileges and those who carry on these functions during the course of the day, are the best people to carry on the overtime as well. It would be a rather difficult provision, as far as I can see; but if the hon. member would like me to investigate the possibility of taking on more staff, it will mean that during the day these people will be sitting down and there is no definite shift system because of the irregularity with which this work is done. There are administrative difficulties, and I am not shutting out the possibility; but if it means an increase of the established staff with all the other increases, then I may not look at the proposal favourably.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would urge that as soon as possible, because this is \$15,000 for overtime and with the explanation which the hon. Premier has given, these fees are not recoverable. There are persons who work in connection with the landing of goods and those fees are recoverable. I am happy to hear that these fees are paid in and they are paid out. I would like the Hon. Minister to go much further into this matter; this is a question of officers working in the Customs as a result of the landing of goods for which the agents are paying out overtime. I am quite satisfied with the explanation which has been given, but I would like the Minister of Finance to go into this matter very carefully. I quite agree that there will be times when you cannot put juniors to do this kind of work. I would like a further explanation of this \$15,000 overtime at some later stage.

The question that the sum of \$46,738 under Head 13 - Customs - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 - INLAND REVENUE

Head 14 - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, I am asking leave that a new item - Item 25 A - Overtime Fees - be inserted. That amendment is to be

made on page 30 of the Estimates; the amendment will read "to be inserted (to be voted) \$400".
12.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in the column "to be voted" the sum of \$400 should be inserted, and the note to Item 25A should read "Provision to pay overtime fees in connection with the preparation of revaluation lists for the Northern and Southern Districts." The Northern District has been done already.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier can tell me if he has found, since he has taken over, the reason for the sudden change in the District and whether they are using that valuation now as against the reduced or increased valuation. I am not supposed to know which it is now. Maybe he has found in his office a reason for the rush in doing it, because the Minister will recall that it should have been done every five years. I understand that the Northern District has been done in three years and you are going to use that valuation. Are you going to use that valuation and allow the Southern District and the Municipality to remain at the same valuation? Possibly the Minister has found reasons for the sudden revaluation of these areas.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this matter came up before me a few weeks ago, and I cannot remember the precise reason. I know the Northern District has been revalued and I know that the Southern District is going to be done this year, because I remember definitely that most of this amount is for the Southern District and not for the City Council at all. The Northern District has been done and the Southern District is to be done, but the City Council for some reason on which I am not clear is not going to be done this year.

Now I really do not understand why the revaluation was brought forward, because I do not believe it was due at the time when the Northern District was done, but it was brought forward; and it is from the experience gained in the revaluation list of the Northern District that this sum has been asked for. When the matter came up to me I sent back to the Local Government Commissioner and told him that I understood why he wanted money to do the North because he was ordered to do it in a hurry, but I did not understand, since he had the whole area, why he should want more money for the Southern District. He came to see me about it and explained that this calls for a certain amount of overtime work, and said that although he would try to get it done in spare moments during the normal working hours, it was expected that we would insert some provision for overtime although they would not be working under the same pressure with which they did the North, and if they did not use it, then the sum would lapse. Up to now I do not know why this matter was pushed forward like that for the Northern District, but it was pushed forward in a matter of two or three weeks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation, but I am sure he will go further into this. This is more than meets the normal eye. This came before your Government took over and you would not be responsible for having done this, and you will appreciate that to rush the re-valuation for the North and South - whether it is reduced or increased we do not know - makes one come to the conclusion that the principle of valuing the North, the South and the Municipality was not the same. Now you have changed, and this came into operation in 1962-63 in preparation of your Estimates for administering your affairs, and it leaves the South and the Municipality either at an advantage or a disadvantage, neither of which I presume you are able to say at the minute, because instructions were given before your time. You know that all the areas should be revalued at the same time, that is in five years, and this indecent haste makes it appear that it was done with some motive. I am not saying that there was an ulterior motive, but it may create a disadvantage in this area. I suggest that you go into the matter because it will put the South and the North either at an advantage or disadvantage which I do not know at the moment; but it does not look right to me to have one area done and the other two areas not done. You may observe the law in one case, and then you might have to do the other areas now because you may find a row being kicked up.

I thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation and I counsel him to make diligent enquiries into this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know what information the hon. member has, but Section 147 of the Local Government Act says that valuation should be carried out in the fourth and sixth years, and on 31st September, 1961, it was amended to be third and fifth years. This re-valuation for the North had to be completed in less than four months. Again I do not understand what was the reason behind the amendment to the Act, but there has been an amendment. I would be grateful for any information, but I am afraid I do not have time to go around playing detective.

The question that the sum of \$17,865 under Head 14 - Inland Revenue - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 - STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$16,920 under Head 15, Statistical Service, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$16,920 under Head 15 - Statistical Service - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 - FEDERATION

Head 16 - Federation - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, we will pass over Head 16 as that money is fixed by law. Until we move an amendment, we cannot interfere with it. I would just like to explain for hon. members who may have any fears, quite apart from the Order-in-Council, that before they can get money the Governor General has to send a request. He cannot request all the money in advance. He sends requests, as far as I can gather, at periods of two months in advance; therefore they will not be getting any money from us over and above what we consider necessary for them to have. If we get a request and they can justify it, they will get it. It does not mean that this \$780,326 is there in the Bank for them to draw. It is fixed by law and not subject to the Legislature at all; it is just like a consolidated vote. Until we change the law, and obviously we do not want to change it just yet, they will have to send requests.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would suggest that you go very carefully on it.

HEAD 17 - PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS

Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments to Head 17. Item 23 - Book and Publications - should be increased by \$50, and the revised provision is now \$3,250.

Item 26 - The W.I. Gazette - is reduced by \$1,130 and the revised provision will therefore be \$1,000. Both these amendments are on page 35.

I beg to move that the sum of \$59,057 under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier anticipated me. The hon. senior member for the City does not understand that there are many ways to choke a dog. We are considering the cost of Item 23 which covers Army and Navy Lists, West Indian Law Reports and Item 26, W.I. Gazette. This is not the Official Gazette; this is the West Indian Gazette that is printed by the West Indian Government. I want to say now, Sir, that even the further contribution to the West Indian Gazette in my humble opinion is a waste of money and time, because making a contribution to

read how they are going to utilise our funds or merely administer our funds is something I do not favour.

Mr. Chairman, I will however take this opportunity on the question of our West Indian Laws and our W.I. Gazette to say that we no longer seem to have a West Indian nation as envisaged in this amount we are providing; and now that the Hon. Premier is in the House, I want to take this opportunity of saying - and I think a Barbadian should do it - that I appreciate very much the liberal, sensible and democratic attitude of the Government and the Premier in including in his delegation members of all sections of the House in the last Federal discussions, because they were of a national character, and it was good that the point of view of all sections could be presented. I would like also to take this opportunity to remind the Hon. Premier that there is a Resolution here by me criticising the West Indian Government for the wanton waste of our money, and we feel strongly about it.

Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect which I would like to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention, and it is that I would like Mr. Maudling, Mr. Hugh Fraser or anybody else to know that although the West Indian Federal Government has so mismanaged its affairs as to cause the West Indies to be looked upon disparagingly, I must say here today that I do not approve of the methods which have been used. I do not know what the lawyers will say, but as a Barbadian standing for the rights of Barbadians, I would say that the West Indian Government and Ministers have by their actions caused the British Parliament to take the action it did. I hope the Hon. Premier would not take it that way, because he is saying that you cannot prevent the British Parliament from doing something. I know how to prevent them from doing things, and I feel very strongly that this House should protest over the method used in dissolving the West Indian Federal Constitution.

12.50 p.m.

I know that in dissolving it that they have dissolved it in such a manner that Barbados now in its present position can be controlled by an Order-in-Council when for the last 300 years Barbados was never controlled by any Order-in-Council. The Order now gives the Queen, through no fault of ours, that power; and it is through the fact that we were members of the West Indian Federation; therefore, when we became a unit territory we gave up some of our sovereignty.

Now that the British Parliament has decided to dissolve the Federation, they are dissolving it in such a manner that we can be controlled by Order-in-Council. They will first determine that Trinidad and Jamaica will go out on Order-in-Council, and then by Order-in-Council they will make provision for the other eight units which remain. It means that if we do not get a new independent state, and there is any hiatus taking place within the next five, six, seven, eight or nine years, Barbados will find itself in the position that although the Premier may have internal control, the Queen by Order-in-Council can determine anything concerning this Colony without the matter going through the British Parliament.

The Bahamas has not changed, and despite what the Prime Minister has said about the Bahamas, although it is true to say that they do not have the liberal voting methods which we have, they still have a constitution which the Queen cannot suspend. I am sure that the Hon. Premier would remember when they had their dispute in the Bahamas that the Secretary of State for the Colonies said that he could not treat the Bahamas as they treated British Guiana. An Order-in-Council can suspend the constitution of British Guiana, but not that of the Bahamas; therefore the British Government will be more cautious in doing the suspension than if it were done by Order-in-Council.

I had the privilege of seeing a young man who was less than 30 years old in Tanganyika, Mr. Kawawa and another friend; and although it looks to me as just yesterday, it was three years ago. One of those young men said in Congress Hall that they were going to tell Mr. MacMillan that they wanted their independence. Mr. Tom Mboya who is less than thirty years too is seeking independence for his country and

they are all standing up to the British people and telling them what they want; and although you have all this idea that the West Indians feel themselves superior to the Africans, the position is that there are few territories in Africa which do not have independence.

Although I realise that the West Indian politicians have put us in the invidious position that the British Parliament finds itself in this spending spree in which these politicians want to engage themselves in, yet at the same time, it has exerted public opinion in something which is distasteful to any Barbadian and any Socialist in this era by having the Queen to be able to legislate for us by Order-in-Council.

I am sure that the Hon. Premier should realise that if I have to talk to Mr. Maulding, Mr. Fraser, Mr. MacMillan, the Queen or anybody, I am going to tell them that so far as I am concerned, I am working here and paying taxes and I do not understand anybody at Westminster passing any Order-in-Council for Barbados. Let Mr. Fraser understand our position straight in certain things. Your Honour knows my views and I want Mr. Maulding and Mr. MacMillan to understand that we in the Barbados House of Assembly must protest against any idea of putting us back to a position of being governed by an Order-in-Council. We do not know anything about it. We have not been accustomed to it. That was in the days when people begged for money. The people in Africa moved forward from being governed in Order-in-Council to independence. I feel that if the British Government has to dissolve the constitution of the West Indies Federation, the lawyers must see to it that it would not hurt the constitutional position which this territory held prior to entering into the Federation.

1.00 p.m.

I feel that our position, the *status quo*, should remain in so far as Barbados is concerned, and we would not be relegated to a situation where the Barbados Government should be subject to an Order-in-Council. I do not think it should be forced on us and I do not think we should sit down very easily on this. I appreciate the reasons; hon. members know my views about this spending of money; they know how strongly I feel about it. I feel extremely strongly about it; but I will not feel strongly about it and at the same time give away my sacred rights in that I see that the constitution has been so emasculated that we have to go back to the Order-in-Council. Just as the old fighters had to make Barbados what it is, now that I have been living long enough to have these privileges, we should not have the slightest diminution of any constitutional power which we maintain as a result of our colleagues placing us in this position. The Hon. Premier and the House should be unanimous today in that our constitutional position cannot be settled by any Order-in-Council.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. member that the House should be unanimous in this matter. If what the hon. member says is correct, then we are going to be unanimous on it. If this Order-in-Council will affect the constitution of Barbados, well, then, we will be unanimous on this question; but we are not trained in this matter in relation to these territories individually and collectively. I want to assure the hon. member that if it will interfere with what our forefathers have fought for, what we have enjoyed, then we must fight for it. We are all agreed with the hon. member that the Hon. Premier should act and act immediately in the circumstances. There should not be any division and as far as we are concerned, the hon. member can count on our support. I am wondering if this Order-in-Council only applies to our grant which we make to the Federal Government; I am wondering if it only applies to the Federal Government but not in so far as the Unit Constitution is concerned. If it applies to the Unit Constitution then I say that our Premier should act, and act as he always does.

There are those of my Party who are trained in constitutional law and we can sit and discuss this matter. The hon. member has read something in the newspapers which I have read also and I am much concerned about it. The Prime Minister shoots off his mouth with a lot of things, Gomes shoots off his mouth with a lot of things and the real con-

stitutional men in the West Indies advise that this is so and that is not so. If the hon. member can establish it is a fact that this Order-in-Council interferes with the constitution in Barbados which has been fought for for so many years, and we are faced with our position being reduced to that of the Bahamas and Bermuda, then we are 100% behind the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter; we will stop at nothing in order to maintain what we originally had, in Barbados. I speak for the four of us on this side of the House and for the people whom we represent in this island as well.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has brought up this matter under Item 23 "Books and Publications" and Item 26 "The W.J. Gazette", I should like to say that we do not have to vote for the mandatory levy for the Federation. I did not come in here to discuss the question of Federation, but I can tell the hon. member something about these votes. The first part of his statement was to the effect that we should not be subscribing to publications of the Federal Government. I have gone into the matter very carefully; the Federal Government was one of the first things I turned my mind to in the elimination of votes on items. The position is that the West Indian Law Reports are behindhand. I am still subscribing to the laws which come from England; I have to pay my subscription every month because I want my list complete although I am not practising law. I want to give hon. members the assurance that not one single member of our Cabinet is carrying on his profession as long as he is a member of the Cabinet. As to the Hon. Minister for Communications, he is one classic example; there is no doubt that he is not practising his profession or calling. He is no longer at sea; and the other hon. members of the Cabinet have given an undertaking and they have had to sever connections with the businesses which they formerly carried on.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I am still subscribing to the West Indian Law Reports published by Butterworth. I do not think that we have the complete set of volumes for the year 1961 up to now. Part of this provision is to meet the cost of West Indian Law Reports. As far as the "West Indian Gazette" is concerned, the hon. member said that he does not want to read the debates. However, it is not only a question of the debates but it is also a question of the Regulations which are published. If there is any kind of profit in that, these Gazettes go to the Law Courts, to the Library and to the Attorney General's Chambers. I want to assure hon. members that we will not vote any money for these things other than what may be necessary. The number has been cut down from 50 to 5.

1.10 p.m.

We will therefore have a copy for the Chief Justice, a copy for the Attorney General, two copies for the Law Library and, I believe, a copy in my office at the Ministerial Buildings. The number has been substantially reduced, but we must have reference material in case anything arises.

Now as I said before, I did not come here prepared to discuss the constitutional *impasse* with which we are now confronted, but if I may speak directly from my memory of what has taken place during the past few weeks, the actions of the Federal Legislators and Cabinet Members have brought a certain amount of ignominy and disgrace upon all the people in the West Indies. Hon. members in here have expressed their disapproval of the high-handed action of the Federal Legislature in voting money for itself or what they choose to call "disengagement allowance". One member went so far as to say that if he was going to be released he wanted it to be a pleasant experience, and the degree of the pleasantness would be closely associated with the quantum of compensation which was paid to him. That is what I read in the debates of the Federal Chamber.

Now two things clearly emerge from the decision of the territory of Jamaica; but before I deal with that, I would like to come back and say that when the Federal Constitution was set up, each of the ten subscribing territories agreed to hand over certain powers, limited as they might have been, and functions to the Federal Government, and these were placed on the Exclusive Legislative List; there

are other matters which they placed on the Concurrent List over which the Unit Legislatures and the Federal Government can exercise equal jurisdiction. There is no problem in so far as the second List is concerned, but there is a problem as far as the Exclusive List is concerned, because the Unit Territories would have absolutely no authority now, having joined in a Federation and having surrendered these powers to the Federal Government; therefore a lacuna would be left by the dissolution of the Federation which will probably take place next month, the deadline set by the colony of Jamaica. It is my opinion — I cannot speak for the Colonial Office — that the apparent arbitrary powers which by Act of Parliament have been vested in Her Majesty-in-Council, which in the final analysis is really the Queen acting on the advice of his experts, and the purpose of inserting such a harsh provision was not to embarrass any person — I am putting the best construction on the motives of the United Kingdom Parliament — but to provide for, in case of emergency, carrying on the functions which were carried on by the Federal Government under the exclusive powers which they had in the Federal Constitution.

1.20 p.m.

The Bill which was presented to the United Kingdom Parliament and passed in the House of Lords gives power to legislate for us by Order-in-Council at three different levels. First, by providing for the secession of any territory from the Federation; secondly, to legislate by Order-in-Council — if you call it legislation — for carrying on any aspect of Government of the remaining territories; and thirdly, by making provision by Order-in-Council for the establishment of any new Federation.

I do not think any hon. members would have any quarrel with the first two. I believe legally speaking they were intended to exercise the powers vested in respect of the three subjects which I have just mentioned, that is, to make provision for any of the other territories by Order-in-Council. If it were intended to take the initiative from the House of Assembly in this Island — and I say House of Assembly advisedly because we are the people responsible for legislation — then this would be clearly contrary to the parliamentary traditions which we attained before we went into Federation in 1958. As a matter of fact, we had that power in 1658 or even before that. Only in 1860 they made laws to force their will, but it was unsuccessful, upon the Parliament of Barbados; but for over 300 years, this territory was never legislated for by Order-in-Council except in so far as we asked them to make us part and parcel of the Federal Government territory.

If that Order-in-Council was going to be used now to tell us what to do — as far as I can see the power is largely permissive and may not be necessarily exercised in the second category of cases for which it was ordained at all, in so far as Barbados was concerned, except in so far as such matters which may be left over to His Excellency and may be in GATT; but I think it will be still necessary for some kind of regulations to be made because we have already surrendered our powers to the Federal Government. We deemed it necessary in order to go into the Federation to do so. Unless the United Kingdom Parliament is going by Order-in-Council to redress those powers in the eight remaining territories of the Federation which would rather be a cumbersome machinery, there would have to be some authority for carrying on the finances in this category of matters; and it was for that reason that when we had our Conference here, each of the parties which attended strongly recommended that there should be absolutely no hiatus in the setting up of a new independent Federation of the eight territories attending the conference, because if any powers were to be transferred, we felt that those powers should be transferred into our hands as we had given them up to the Federal Government.

As the law stands, if we get some kind of arbitrary power by the Commissioner who exercises this, you will get a very serious situation in this Island. But I do not think that in the United Kingdom, the Secretary of State, whoever he may be, would be so much out of his mind, as long as the Barbados House of Assembly is comprised of the members which it now has, as to say that he is going to legislate for the

Island of Barbados in any matter in which we feel that we should legislate for ourselves. That day has long passed.

Technically, it is a retrograde step so far as we are concerned. The Federal Government by their antics have brought ignominy on the fair name of the West Indies; therefore drastic measures had to be taken to save them from their folly. But I do not think legislation should be made to extend the boundaries over Barbados and any of the other territories; and it is for that reason and also because the Chief Ministers from the other Islands during the past week or so have been cabling me expressing fears about this provision that I thought it necessary that I should make very strong representation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies about this matter. Although the text of the cable is a matter which is not to be of general knowledge, hon. members will have to take it that I have made general representation. I have called on the Secretary of State for the Colonies to make a clear and unequivocal statement that the powers vested by the Order-in-Council should not be exercised in such a way as to diminish in one iota the present constitutional rights enjoyed by these eight territories. As soon as I receive a reply from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which I expect in the next 48 hours, I intend to make a statement on the matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know the West Indian Prime Minister. The West Indian Prime Minister is a man who is on his way out. He has no chair to sit down on now. The West Indian Prime Minister has now come back from a failure mission, and what by innuendo you hear him saying is that the people in Westminster have no respect for the "Little Eight". By his own statement, he thinks that he can do something to diminish the "Little Eight".

I know the Colonial Office as well as any member of this House. When the Colonial Office sees that your bat is knocked out of your hands, they know that they can bowl anything at you. They say that if you must hit them now, you must hit them with your hands. What I am afraid of is that up there they believe that the Barbadian, being very decent and very quiet, will not make any row. I appreciate that the Hon. Premier is in a position of negotiations over this matter and, therefore, he will have to be very delicate. However, I am not in the position of negotiating with anybody. I am on the outside urging you on to let the Colonial Office know that we are not going to be satisfied, and that we will be so silent that they would believe that they can do as they like.

The Order-in-Council, as the Hon. Premier has said, is divided into three parts; but what I am worried about is the fact that we gave up all that we possessed when we happened to be Barbados in the Federal Government, and as the Federal Government no longer exists, the Colonial Office had to use these drastic measures because they had drastic people to deal with.

What I want to emphasise, and what we all must emphasise, is that because we agree with the drastic measures which the British Government had to use, we do not agree that these same drastic measures have to be interpreted to mean that we have surrendered our original right. It is all well for us to say these things, but it is for people to know what we say. The powers which we gave away to raise the West Indian Federation, we do not want to give those powers to any Commissioner because our money which we have subscribed at mandatory level is something with which we can do something else. We want the Secretary of State for the Colonies to know that he is not going to tell us about viability because I am one serious man when you tell me that I am not viable. If my father was poor and my mother was poor, they could not tell me that I should be rich. How can you tell us about viability when you brought us all the way from Africa here? At one time they will tell you about self-sufficiency. Now they call it economic viability. How do you mean that we are not viable? They say that "constitutionally we know that you have the ability to rise but you are not economically viable." We are not afraid of these statements being used about us, but then these statements are being used by the same Prime Minister of the West Indies. He is talking about the same viability. Why are St.

Lucia and Dominica grant-aided territories? You must ask yourself what attempt was made to relieve them from being grant-aided territories when the Crown ruled them. Nobody gave us any money. If you have a lot of children, they tell you that you have too many children; and if you do not have a lot of children, they tell you that your problem is too small. You have the vote, but they would not send you to school; therefore they tell you that because you have not been to school you cannot vote. You have to praise the British people; but I know them from the point of view of Colonial Office and from the point of view of the Trade Union. I went to a football match in England and you had to line up to get in. I lined up with the others and a policeman came to me and told me that I would have to go back further. By that time the line was from here to the Garrison. I told him that I am not going back. I told him that he could bring the Home Secretary, I was not moving. If I had looked at him in a trembling manner, he would have moved me further back in the line. You have to stand up to these people and let them know what you mean. Look what they call these eight territories! Look how they regard us because they are going to give Jamaica independence and because Trinidad would soon be getting her independence! They are calling us the "Little Eight". There is no question about this. Trinidad is going to get her independence soon. From the beginning Dr. Eric Williams did everything and the people said "Look what he is doing". Now you have got yourself in a situation because you were too easy. I think it is time that from this floor we should tell Mr. Maudling, or Mr. Spaulding, Mr. Fraser or whoever it is, that this is how we look upon them. Because he has come here and laughed with us, we are no "Little Eight"; we are representing big people.

1.30 p.m.

If we do not assert ourselves like men, they will be pushing us back, giving us words and pet phrases. We want money and we must get money just as all the others got money. Lybia is an independent country and she has received \$27 million within the last five years. In some instances they run out from these places and they run into the West Indies which is the liveliest spot they have to come out and live in. I heard the hon. member wishing that the "Little Eight" might succeed, but his Party cannot resurrect anything in Barbados. Now that there is an opportunity for somebody to get credit, the Prime Minister is coming back as the prophet of gloom.

There was a time when we had the best constitution in the whole world; there was also a time when you heard that the Barbados Workers' Union was the best Union in the World. That is when the Prime Minister was there; as soon as he is in anything it is the best thing; but as soon as he cannot live anywhere, he will find somewhere in exile. The Prime Minister is saying that the reason why the Federation was broken up was because of the other colleagues; but we have to assert ourselves in such a manner that the people in Britain or the Colonial Office will not get the idea that we who remain are incapable of doing anything about the matter.

West Indians have the idea that Adams, Williams and Manley have all the sense that there is in the world. I want to say that there are groups of African leaders who did not go to any Universities; but yet they are leading figures. I feel it is time that the West Indians stand up as one man. We are better than the Africans or the Gold Coast. I am very glad to hear that the Hon. Premier has voiced my sentiments in relation to this matter. Sometimes you will find that you have to be tough and people say that you can shout as much as you like. The Australian and New Zealand people went to talk about representation in America, and I am sure that they are not coming out without anything because they are fighting. We must be prepared to carry on this struggle and do not remain in a situation where the Colonial Office will feel that we are depending upon them to take the initiative and do something for us. I am very glad to hear the Hon. Premier make the statement that he has telegraphed them in no uncertain terms. When a Legislature is prepared to do something, it shows that not only the Government is in favour or something, but also the people who are represented in the Legislature. I am sure that the Hon. Premier and other members of the delegation are aware of all the moves which will be made at this stage to make it

difficult for this "Little Eight" to succeed. I quite realise the danger, because if the "Little Eight" do not succeed, then these colonies will not be colonies. I have in mind that everybody will break off and go to Jamaica and therefore you will have a gradual disintegration and that will make the Order-in-Council become more powerful. I think that we have to act very quickly and desperately in a matter such as this.

The question that the sum of \$59,057 under Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, at this stage, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.40 p.m.

On Resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN took the Chair.

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 69 on page 39, the note to this Item should read as follows:-

"Annual contribution of the Barbados Government. Increase to pay increments of Staff, higher salaries as a result of the Salaries Revision, and increased running costs due to greater number of students in training."

I beg to move that the sum of \$413,025 under Head 18 - Police - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 - FIRE SERVICE

Head 19 - Fire Service - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$43,012 under Head 19 - Fire Service - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 20 — LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 20 — Local Government — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$22,383 under Head 20 — Local Government — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 21 — ECCLESIASTICAL

Head 21 — Ecclesiastical — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$85,668 under Head 21 — Ecclesiastical — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 22 — PREMIER — CABINET AND GENERAL

Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under Head 22 on page 46, Item 12 — Emergency Relief Funds — should be deleted. Instead of the vote of \$10,000 the amount should now be nil, and the note should also be deleted.

The idea of the Emergency Relief Fund is that you need lanterns, pickaxes, shovels and medical supplies in case of a hurricane or matter of that kind when you would have money to pay for them, but our experience is that in any emergency any store in Bridgetown is quite willing to supply the Government with these goods. I think the credit of the Government is reasonably good in Broad Street and in Roebuck Street, and it is not necessary to insert this provision, because if there was a hurricane, let us say, on a Saturday or Monday or any other day of the week, you would hardly expect the Accountant General to open the Treasury on that day to pay this money. The vouchers would have to be passed in one day; so that amount has been deleted from the Estimates. It does not mean that we do not intend to get supplies in case of an emergency, but I think the business community would be quite willing to advance these supplies, as we actually experienced at the time of the last hurricane.

I beg to move that the sum of \$55,691 under Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on that. I believe it is contrary to accepted policy, whether or not the Government should be free, to call on merchants either in Broad Street or in Swan Street to supply goods without the decision of the Legislature. I agree with the Premier that it can be done, but I am not altogether sure that it is proper for the Premier or for that matter for any Minister to commit the Legislature in advance.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I think that in a matter of this sort the Local Government plays its part first. I remember on the last occasion when the hurricane struck that I had hoped to leave the Island, but I found myself in the afternoon in Roebuck Street delivering what bread I had there. I knew that somebody would pay for it, and I think any merchant would come out at any hour of the night to give supplies to the Local Government. They are the first people to move into action, and then if the burden is too great for them, the Government comes in and reimburses. You will remember the flood which we had in Constitution Road.

Local Government was there first, and in those days the Government at the time refused to underwrite the excess expenditure which the Local Government had incurred. That caused a precedent. But I think that today if anything happened in the Island, it would be the duty of the Local Government to relieve the distress first, because it would take time for the Government to make the necessary assessments and get the statistics to come to the House.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Item 12, I can assure you that in my constituency in the Northern District, we have our equipment prepared from last year, and I am sure that if you go around this district you will see that we have the equipment prepared and kept in order for such purposes. But I must agree with the hon. member who spoke last that in the case of an emergency we would have to appeal to the Government. We do not wait until the day comes to prepare, and I believe that the Southern District have their equipment ready also.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that the administration of the Bridgetown City Council moved into action on the last occasion and everything was done promptly, efficiently and with despatch. It is fortunate, Sir, that the Northern Area of the Island is seldom exposed to hurricane force, but Local Government being so near the people and especially in the Municipality, I think hon. members may rest assured that in the unhappy event of such a catastrophe striking the island, proper action will be taken immediately.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on Item 11 — Constitutional Changes, to which the note reads "To meet extraordinary expenditure such as actuaries' fees." I am not clear on that. Then there is Item 8 — Conference and Delegations. The hon. senior member for the City is not in his place now, but I heard him comment on the amount of money that was spent by the Federal Prime Minister on a suite in London costing \$55 a day, and warn the Premier not to follow that example. I understand that the Premier does not follow that example, but he has gone to the other extreme. I would say to the Premier that the advice of the hon. senior member for the City may be good; it is good to be prudent; but I remember hearing the hon. junior member for Christ Church say that if you are going to entertain, you should do it well and if you are not going to do it well, do not do it at all.

Mr. Chairman, I went to New York soon after the Premier did, and I understand that he was not in a suite similar to that of the Prime Minister; he stayed at a Hotel called the New Yorker. I will tell you that the New Yorker may be all right if you want to get near to Robert Hall if you want to buy a cheap suit; but from the point of view of being in a place where the Premier of Barbados is going to meet people on an equal level, I want to say that Americans and outsiders test you by the hotel where you stay. If they telephoned and heard that the Premier of Barbados was staying at the New Yorker, they would do little to get in touch with him there; so I do not see why he could not stay at the Statler-Hilton Hotel or the Waldorf Astoria or some of the other good hotels.

2.40 p.m.

I only mentioned that by the way because I have spoken to other people in Barbados and in New York, and when I told a friend that the Premier was at the New Yorker Hotel, he said: "That is the hotel where a man killed a woman the other day". We do not want to be so parsimonious as regards our delegations.

I feel that a Government delegation when it is travelling should travel with the dignity which a Government delegation should have. I hope the Hon. Premier will relax from that method. Maybe, he may have very good reasons for staying at the New Yorker, and he may have preferred to stay there in his private capacity. It is true to say that the New Yorker is more liberal than other hotels.

I would therefore ask the Hon. Premier not to take what the hon. senior member for the City said right through and through because I know the hon. senior member for the City would not want him to be as parsimonious as all of that. At

the same time, I do not see that there is anything wrong in the Leader of a delegation having a suite. I feel that the Prime Minister should as a matter of right have a suite. I do not think that the Prime Minister should be in a room because the people whom he has to meet cannot be met in a room. You can entertain a small party in a suite; therefore, I feel that the Leader of a delegation should have the preference of being able to meet people in a suite where he can also do a little entertaining.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, while the Hon. Premier is searching the files to make his reply, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I think our Premier ought to be accommodated in the best possible surroundings. I, myself, have found out that we should always try to strike the happy medium. A suite for \$55 a day is only for bed and breakfast, and then two meals under that plan would have to be added on to that. I have always found it is always better when one is in a strange land to have a good address, especially when that person is conducting negotiations with people in that land. If a foreign person came here and was staying at a certain hotel in Bay Street I would not consider that he would be the man with whom we should have to make a rush to have business. You should stay at a place which is dignified and one at which other people would like to meet you.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer hon. members as regards this matter of hotels, if I stayed at the Waldorf-Astoria, as some West Indian friends of mine did when I went to the United States, I would be accused of extravagance. I had to stop visiting the Waldorf-Astoria and visiting my friends there because whenever I got out of my taxi I had to give the taxi driver \$1 U.S., and whenever I came back out I had to give him another \$1 U.S.

I would like to say that the hotel which I stayed at was a highly respectable one in the medium range and it was on a street where it was convenient to get down to Wall Street to meet the appointments which we had to make.

As far as we were concerned, the Hon. Minister of Trade, the Permanent Secretary and myself, we were quite comfortable. We had a modest suite where we could do some entertaining; therefore we found it very convenient and very safe and chiefly from a geographical point of view it was most convenient.

If you say that I am to have a suite in the Waldorf-Astoria, I would be only too happy to do so because at my age I believe in some comforts. For seven years, I have been in attendance in the Air Force. I am quite disposed to be comfortable if I think it was in keeping with the conscience of the populace of Barbados. I would like to assure hon. members that I do not believe in extravagant expenditure just because the expenses would not be paid by me. As I think it should be, we have to relate our expenses to the economy of the country from which the paying would come.

As regards to Constitutional Changes, I honestly do not understand what is the extraordinary expenditure such as actuaries' fees. I will have it investigated and I will report back to the House.

The question that the sum of \$55,691 under Head 22, as amended, do now stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 23 - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 23 - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Under Head 23, on page 47, Item 15, Caretakers, the vote is to be increased by \$18, making the revised provision of \$2,303.

I beg to move that the sum of \$77,251 under Head 23, Barbados Regiment, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 24 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LANDS AND FISHERIES

Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before moving that Head 24 stand part of the Schedule, there is one amendment which I would like to move in.
2.50 p.m.

I am asking leave to insert a new Item - Item 89A - Co-operative Section (to be voted) \$840. The Note to that Item to read as follows:- "Provision to pay for the audit of Co-operative Societies Accounts during the year 1962-63". That is in connection with the auditing expenses and it is for the payment of a part-time auditor. I think that we will follow the usual practice, which is to ask leave to make these amendments, and when the motion is made that this Head stand part of the Schedule, we will reply to any question which hon. members may like to raise.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that the sum of \$1,042,924 under Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in connection with Item 33, "Inspector of Friendly Societies". I do not know if this question is appropriate at this time but I would still like to ask the Hon. Minister about it. Some time ago a few Friendly Societies were forced to be dissolved, and the trustees of some of these societies found it very difficult to get the necessary amount of money to allocate to members of the society on account of the death of one of the Government officers concerned with the societies. One of the members asked me about this matter and I could not tell him anything about it. I tried to make some enquiries before the Election took place but I did not get any information on the matter. I understand that the matter was under consideration and I am wondering if the Hon. Minister can help me in relation to this matter, if not now, at some future time. People were confused over the matter because they said that the societies were forced to be dissolved and they said that money was due to them. I would be glad if the Minister would go into the matter and let me know what is the intention of the Government relative to the refund of this money.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on page 59 of these Estimates and Item 98 - Light - you will notice that there is an amount of \$4,000 for that item. What I would like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention is that the Barbados Light and Power Company, whilst enjoying the privileges of a public utility service are getting away with a lot of murder in this island. This is the only place where you have to pay somebody for your keeping something for him. It is just like my bringing a motor car to your place and you have to pay for keeping it for me. The consumers are expected to pay for keeping the meters of the Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd. I do not fully contribute to that. Another thing is that sometimes they charge a customer as much as \$3,000 for the purpose of installing light at his home, but that customer has not got any control over the number of installations that follow into other people's homes. One man can afford to pay this money; but when he has done that, everybody can get their light installed from the poles without having to pay any reimbursement to the man who paid for the erection of the poles.

Again, Mr. Chairman, nobody can explain to me what is meant by the surcharge; you are charged and then you are charged on that charge. This thing amounts to robbery with violence. During the War years quite a number of people had their homes wired, but owing to the position of the house or the district in which the house was, it was not suitable for the Electric Company to supply the necessary meters; but in Worthing View on Mr. Clairmonte's land, all of those people got their meters although they were telling us before that they did not have these light meters. People had to pay something like 10 shillings to have their places inspected in order to see if the wiring had been properly done. After two years the Company started to get meters and they were

in a quandary to know whether they should supply meters to people on the former certificate which had been issued or if they should go all over again. I think it was unreasonable after making people pay to have these places inspected, for them to go all over again, and they called in a certain Mc.Guffie of the former Government to tell them what to do. This gentleman, who was supposed to be representing poor and under-privileged people, advised the Electric Company to make these people pay again. These were not the people in the so-called residential areas; they were people like you and me who could not afford it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is correct.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, these things must be stopped. If we are representing the people's interest, then we must look out for these people, irrespective of class, colour or creed. We cannot tell the Barbados Light and Power Company how to run their business, but I am saying that they are practising segregation in Barbados. They have air-conditioned offices for a certain class of worker and in other places where there is no air-conditioning they have at work people looking like you and me.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention of my Government that if this thing was done before, as long as I am a member of this Legislative body, it has got to stop. I am going to keep pounding it out until somebody hears what I say. If we are going to allow the Electric Company to enjoy the privileges of a Utility Service — and as far as I know a utility means something for the general community — then we cannot go on condoning the practice of these people looking out for a select few. I do want the Minister to enquire from the Electric Company in the near future and let us know the reason for the surcharge and what is a surcharge. Before I sit down, I would like also to know something about this "variation cost".

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I would like to say on Item 98 which is for lighting at the various markets. I would like to know, Sir, if there is light.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what Item is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. CORBIN: I am speaking on Item 98. What I want to find out is whether this Government is still paying for light for the market at Six Roads. This market was built for \$35,678, and I want to know if we are still paying money for its upkeep and for staff, because I am certain that not even a billy goat got its head cut off there! That is what the last Government was doing with the taxpayers' money; people without vision and ideas. If I were in the Government at that time, I would have looked around the thickly populated areas such as at Tweedside Road and erected such a market to relieve the congestion in Bridgetown. But they could be from no other than the Lunatic Asylum to go to St. Philip and erect a market for \$35,678. I would like to know if they were erecting that to receive the foreigners when they came at the Airport, because I am sure not a pound of potatoes has been sold there yet, or even a head of lettuce.

Mr. Chairman, I only want the hon. members who remain from the last Government to understand what stupidity was going on in their Government in those days by erecting a market of that nature and of no use. I would like the Minister in charge to look into this matter and see whether we are still paying a staff to open those doors and return home to work in their gardens, and also whether we are still paying the Electric Company for light used at that market. I would ask the Minister also to see if we can do anything with that building by turning it into something else. I do not know if they are going to open a site there in years to come, but it is the most foolish money that has ever been spent by any Government in Barbados. A man that has no honour and understandeth not is likened unto the beast that perisheth. I have never met so much stupidity; but, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, time has been and time will be no more.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, under Item 85, I see the provision of \$80,000 for Subsidy to pig breeders. I should

like to know how that is progressing and whether the expenditure of \$80,000 is justified. The reason why I ask that is because last week I could not get a pound of pork in the Market unless I bought beef also, and I would therefore like to know the justification for this money being spent.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think I will deal with the last question first. It is a fact that the pig population has fallen within the last year or two. I will now quote for the benefit of the hon. member the report for 1960 on the pig subsidy scheme, and I will give a comparison of the applications which have been received over that period. In 1955-56 there were 5,013 applications; in 1956-57, there were 4,741 applications; in 1957-58 there were 4,484 applications; in 1958-59 there were 6,017 applications; in 1959-60 there were 5,259 applications, and in 1960-61 there were 3,818 applications.

You will want to know to what reason we contribute the decline. It is probably difficult to assign the reduction to any one particular factor, but generally speaking these factors are considered to be some of the factors which brought about this present decline. The first is the adverse economic circumstances relative to poor, prevailing agricultural conditions during the year, forcing pig keepers to dispose of their breeding sows.

There is also the unavailability of good breeding stock — there is still an unsatisfied demand for good breeding young pigs from Government Stations by pig keepers — and the death of breeding sows due to acute mastitis infection. The chief causes of mastitis are over-feeding during the late stages of pregnancy, damp bedding, the bacterial fermentation from which provide ideal conditions for infection to an already congested and susceptible udder.

The pig population has fallen, Sir, because to a great extent owing to the tourist trade, pig breeders sell their young piglets when they are six or seven weeks old to make a quick turnover, and it has been of economic benefit to the pig breeders many of whom have received assistance from the Government.

3.10 p.m.

That is one of the main reasons why the pig population has fallen off. We are now establishing pig farms at Bullens, some of the other Agricultural Stations, and one at Sedgepond, and with the implementations of plans for pig breeding within this year's estimates, it is possible that the pig population would increase, with the increase given by the Government and with the issuing of feed at the right time. In other words, issuing this feed after eight weeks serves no useful purpose. We are giving a concentration of the pig feed in four or six weeks so that the sow would receive some of the benefits of the concentrated feed and by so doing there would be a greater chance of more of the piglets being raised and being stronger. There would be a lesser mortality rate. The pig subsidy was given after the seventh week, but we are revising that plan so that it can be issued after the fourth week, and so that it would be more beneficial to the pig breeder.

As far as the other points raised, one in respect of the question of the Six Roads Market, that market to all intents and purposes does not really function and it is not really serving any useful purpose as is well recognised.

I am now proceeding to give a breakdown on the amount which is set out for light for the various markets:-

Cheapside, which includes the slaughterhouse, \$2,040; Fairchild Street, \$850; Eagle Hall, \$140; Oistins, \$16; Speightstown, \$60; we have included a small amount of \$16 for Six Roads; Bay Street, \$198; minor repairs and replacements of apparatus etc., \$700; making a total of \$4,000.

That is the breakdown of expenditure as far as light is concerned. I think two hon. members wanted to know how the money is made up in respect to that Item.

Now, on the question with respect to Friendly Societies which is Item 33, in reality an investigation is being con-

ducted into this matter and I am not in a position to make a final report at this stage. I will give the hon. member the assurance that as soon as the complete report is available I shall communicate with him without undue delay. There is nothing in my file which deals with this specific matter and I am not in a position to give him the final report today. The hon. member can rest assured that the cases will be dealt with on an equitable basis.

The question that the sum of \$1,042,924 under Head 24 as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 25 — MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS, HOUSING AND TOURISM

Head 25 — Ministry of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$124,606 under Head 25, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 26 — HOUSING

Head 26 — Housing — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$45,561 under Head 26, Housing, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 27 — PUBLIC WORKS

Head 27 — Public Works — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$542,908 under Head 27 — Public Works, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: There is no provision in these Estimates for the upkeep of Police Stations and such things.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is in the Capital Estimates.

The question that the sum of \$542,908 under Head 27, Public Works, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28 — PRINTING OFFICE

Head 28 — Printing Office — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$82,880 under Head 28, Printing Office, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 29 — TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 29 — Town and Country Planning — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$25,046 under Head 19, Town and Country Planning, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 30 — WATERWORKS

Head 30 — Waterworks — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,129,454 under Head 30, Waterworks, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 31 — TRANSPORT SERVICES

Head 31 — Transport Services — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$1.00 under Head 31, Transport Services, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: This is a matter which I listened to very carefully in the Premier's speech. I listened to the hon. junior member for Christ Church and I have heard the hon. Premier said yesterday words to the effect that he has no confidence in the Transport Board, but he is not prepared to say if he is going to put in back into private people's hands or that the Government should take it over. He did not commit himself as regards the future policy.

I would say this, Mr. Chairman. I have been through all the records of speeches made in this Chamber on the Transport Board from the beginning of its operation and I have seen that I have been consistent in my views on it. I said from the beginning under the circumstances in which the Government took over the transport services that it was the Government's business to make it efficient. Where I disagree with the Hon. Premier's statement is not on a matter of substance but on a matter of method.

3.20 p.m.

Now there is no point in the Premier going behind the legal provision and saying that the Transport Board is a Statutory Body. The Transport Board is as much the business of the Government as the Deep Water Harbour is; it is also as much the business of the Government as the Post Office and the Waterworks Department are. There are people who are members of the Transport Board who have been appointed by members of the Government. You cannot be a member of the Board unless you are appointed by the Government. All the members of the Board owe their seats to the Government. I do not agree with the Premier when he speaks as if the Government is apart from the Transport Board. If the Government decides to abolish the Transport Board, then the Board cannot keep itself. The Board cannot pay any salary over the sum of \$3,600 unless the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves of the post and of the salary. The Transport Board cannot increase its bus fares unless the Government says that it agrees with the policy of increasing bus fares. Therefore, the Transport Board is not a Statutory Board which can act without the sanction of the Government. I know that the Transport Board over the last two or three years, despite the general criticism that has been made, has made improvements. The Board has closed the gap of the operational costs and I would say that before the Premier brought down general statements and he is satisfied about the financial arrangements, he should be positive and say what the situation is.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying all of this because I feel that I have a responsibility to the community in a general way in that I happen to be representing about 400 of these people who are in the Barbados Workers' Union. We could make it uncomfortable for the public tomorrow morning; if we say that we will not go to work, then a lot of people would not be able to go to work. We can stop this House from meeting to a certain extent; we can call a strike and hold up the whole city. I feel that the Premier has to examine what he says very carefully. I hold no brief for the Transport Board; I have criticised the quality of the Board in the past; I have said that the management — well, unfortunately, the Government in taking over these units did not have any Memorandum on Transport and therefore you had people running the transport but they knew nothing about transport. If the Premier takes over the Government of this country, you take over departments like the Police or the Waterworks Department; but I do not think it is fair to the Transport Board for the Premier to say that he is not giving back the people at the Board this money. If you have

all the members of the Board resigning you cannot say that you are not running a bus service. If you create an emergency with the rolling-stock then you will be in a very difficult position; a man can stop your rolling stock very easily. I hope that some proper action will be taken. If there is general dissatisfaction on the part of the Government about the management of the Transport Board and you allow the management to remain where it is, then you are heading for trouble. There is no point in saying that the people are dishonest. If you get the workers feeling that the people for whom they are working are dishonest, then you will find it extremely difficult to control affairs. You must be very careful as to what you say; if you are going to give back the buses to people, well, give them back the buses; but if you say that you have no confidence in the Transport Board, do you expect the workers to have confidence in its immediate management?

What is going to happen when somebody gives an order to somebody else and he says that he has no confidence in you when he is called upon? I think that you should state quite clearly and unequivocally what is going to happen with the Transport Board. Is the difficulty in the type of buses you have ordered? I have had dealings with the Board and with the new Director; and from my dealings with the Board and the new Director, I say that the new Director understands transport and what is being done better than what has been done before. He has come here and has improved the facilities. On our part, we have done quite a lot to help the operational side. I have heard some ideas and the Minister must know them; you have brought expensive buses; but this Director has a plan or suggestion whereby you buy the chassis and have the bodies of the buses built here; that is what I regard as a fine thing. This Director has the idea of building the body section of the buses which would cheapen the cost of these buses. I am nothing to do with whether a man comes from outside or not; what I am concerned with is his ability, and if he has ability then I will not run him. I do not want anybody to pat me on the back when the job is not being done.

The Minister must say at what point of the Transport it is unserviceable. I do not believe that hon. members have given sufficient attention to the question of public transport. I should like to mention that nearly every private concessionaire has some relative of his as the nearest person who is in the business. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, if you take him as an example, has his wife who gives him assistance; if you take Mr. Birch, he has his sister who gives him assistance. In the case of Mr. Alleyne, his son gives him assistance. As far as Mrs. Weatherhead is concerned, she had to get rid of the buses because she had some son who ran about in motorcars and who could not run the service. She therefore had to give up the buses and go to England.
3.30 p.m.

They cannot run it as a service and make it pay for itself, because they have to pay for everything. Some of the private concessionaires who have made a success of it work like slaves 24 hours a day and snatch only a little bit of sleep. Any of the small men in business will tell you that they cannot make a profit of a business if they have to pay a staff of a certain size in a regulated bus service. The capitalisation of the business cannot afford it. You cannot invest \$25,000 or \$50,000 and pay many people and make a profit out of that, because the profit on that capital expenditure cannot sustain so many people; and that is one of the things we have to understand.

Mrs. Rock runs a business in St. Andrew and she in the main has somebody close to her; but a public service cannot run like that. Nobody is the brother of any person running a public business. You have a Director and Clerks, and the organisation is a business organisation; therefore the bureaucracy of Government always cost more money. So, for every unit which the Government possesses, it would cost them more money to handle than a private person. The hon. junior member for Christ Church runs a business, but he could not employ me in his business and ask me to undertake the same number of hours he is going to undertake in that business. He would have to pay me a lot more than he

himself would feel is right, but he would take his relatives to do jobs which nobody from the outside is going to do at the same price and under the same conditions. Moreover people who work for other people want to have their leisure hours.

Mr. Chairman, the normal working hours at the Transport Board are 48 hours a week, and they have agreed in two years' time to give them breathing space. Members of the House must understand that transport workers in the main work for 48 hours a week, when the normal working week on average in Barbados is 44 or 45 hours, which means that the men who carry the public in Barbados are doing it at 4 hours per week more than everybody else is doing. Carpenters, masons and people in the Government Service work 5 1/2 days a week, but the people in the bus business work six days a week, and we have given them notice, as we do not want to jar the community, that these men are entitled to the same 5 1/2 days as anybody else as a norm. In the next two years we will not be negotiating, but they will automatically go to a forty-four week so that the community cannot expect to knock off from work and find men there to take them home from work while those same men must work longer hours than they. I want to say that the community cannot expect to have people at their service enjoying less favourable working conditions than those for whom they provide this service. They walk about on Sundays and expect a bus every fifteen minutes, but they do not realise that a regular bus service entails higher losses and higher operational expense. The more you put buses on the road with fewer passengers, the less the income is going to be. Let us have a little analysis of this. I am not a member of the Board and I do not have to defend it. I go to the Board to get money, and no matter who is on the Board I will be going for money. I could not be a member of the Board because I could not go to myself for money.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be a retrograde step for any Government to give this service back to private concessionaires. The last Government might have been afraid of it. We say we cannot find people to work at Transport, and yet we recruit workers for the United Kingdom to work with the London Transport Executive. The Hon. Premier was a subordinate to Sir Bryan Robinson who was the last Chairman of the British Transport Commission, and in Great Britain, they paid Lord Belching from I.C.I. £24,000 per annum and used him for transport. The Labour Party in Great Britain criticised the appointment but the Minister of Transport said that if he wanted the job done well he would have to employ top brains and therefore he was paying the man the same money as I.C.I. would have paid him, which was £24,000 - more than the Prime Minister. Lord Belching was taken from I.C.I. to do that job, because millions of pounds were operating in the Transport system in England. The Conservative Government in England took over railways and buses from the Labour Government after the 1951 election, but although they were not believers in nationalisation like the Labour Party, they continued to nationalise transport, and the same nationalised service is finding employment for Barbadians in the United Kingdom. It is not a private service, but a nationalised service which is costing the British Taxpayers money.

When the transport people called for more money, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he wanted a wage freeze, but he had to compete with Frank Cussons who said that he could not have a wage freeze at the expense of the workers. If the Government wants to examine this question of transport, they have to see if they are buying too many buses. If they are buying too many, let them get rid of some and have a brutal examination of the situation. I do not think the Premier should make the broad statement that it is not making money, because that statement has to be used against the background of actual fact. I do not know what the Minister has to tell us today about it; that is actual fact. What is the operational position of the buses in the last year since this new man came? Have they narrowed the gap between the operational expense as against the capital? It is not easy in a new business like this to go along, and I say with all due respect to anybody else, no matter what kind of economist you are, you cannot give me a brand new business

with capitalisation costs beginning in 1962 at so many dollars per annum and ask me to redeem these costs alongside somebody who has been running a business for 25 years, and expect my competitive position is going to be the same. If you do not charge any more for bus fares, my income is not going to be any greater per bus.

Mr. Chairman, when you give the Transport Board an income at one point, and say you have to write that off and they have to take their money to clear off the interest at the Bank, what is going to happen? That is part of the operational cost too. When they have to add the interest to the operational cost and all this money has to be repaid, the more difficult the situation is going to be.

3.40 p.m.

So I say that the Transport Board would be labouring under extreme handicap. You bought old buses, and if the capital cost of them had been laid, I would have known what was the amount. However, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister what system of accounting was utilised. Was all of that cost put to the Transport Board and you ask them to make up for these costs both in the interest rate and in the sinking fund and to undergo the repair cost? Those things you did not realise when you took it over. When the last Government was caught with the buses, nobody sat down and prepared a memorandum on the problem of transport. I do not believe that that has been done yet. Can a Government run transport in Barbados like that? I do not know if the Government has said yet that this is our policy for transport. What I do know is that only a big company equivalent to the Transport Board would be able to take over the service.

What I do think is that the public should be made aware of all that is going on and should be able to say that the chaotic transport system that existed in the colony in the past should no longer exist in Barbados. I see from the City of Bridgetown on evenings all the traffic by 5.30 p.m. is moved off and I think that is a compliment to the service. You are bound to find here and there people on the streets, but it is a fact that the people are moved off. What I do find is that you are providing a service for the people and for their own private arrangements; that is to say, you are also providing a service for excursions, which, in my view, is a good aspect.

A good transport service is part of your industrial system. There is no point ignoring the fact that people who have to go to work need transport to take them to their place of business. You also have to recognise the fact that you have the Coleridge-Parry School in St. Lucy, the Alexandra School in St. Peter, the Alleyne School in St. Andrew, the Lodge School in St. John and the Boys' and Girls' Foundation Schools in Christ Church and their comparative distances at the farthest point is less than one hour's driving from Bridgetown. Since your bus service is improved, the position is that the population at these schools is more than five times the number which existed in the Island thirty years ago. The reason for that is simple. It is because you have an improved transport service. On the other hand, the boy or girl who lives in the country and is going to a school in Bridgetown can catch a bus and get to school. When I was a boy, some of these children could never go to Harrison College or Combermere School in view of the difficult situation as regards transport. If they had an old aunt or uncle living in Bridgetown, well then, they could board and lodge in town and go home at weekends; but the question of going to school at either of these schools was lost to you if you came from the country because it was impossible for your parents to pay for your transport. Twenty-six years ago, you paid 72 cents a day to ride that distance. If you multiply that by five for a school child, it would come to 15 shillings for a week; and that time when a boy would have to pay 15 shillings a week to come to school in Bridgetown a top Civil Servant then was working for \$80 a month. In those days, there were no motor cars and nobody rode to school; you had to walk. The whole thing has been transformed in a comparatively short era.

In twenty-five years, we have seen a complete metamorphosis; therefore, I am going to ask the Hon. Premier

not to be hard on something which you have to face. Accept the challenge and remedy all of the things which need remedying in it. If you are buying too much stock, say so. Look into the situation and see whether they do not have a lot of redundant machinery. See what you can do to relieve congestion. Do not give way to any broad statement on any emotional basis when you have to face up to transport. No matter what Government you are or what political complexion you have, transport in modern times is an essential service and no matter who you are, you have to deal with it; you cannot wash your hands from it, neither can you give it out to people to run for you. You must face up to it by legislating for it and that is not the end of the problem either.

If the Hon. Premier has no confidence in the Transport Board, he should tell the House. There is no point in telling me, "Oh, the workers do not do any work." There are a lot of men who work for \$25 a week today and people want to give them a lot of blame. They say: "Oh, you do not have to work as hard as your grandfather." I do not pat workers on their backs; I tell them that I expect them to put in a full day's work. But I do not expect to hear from you that you have not examined the situation. Examine it and tell us what your examination has revealed because it would clear up a lot of headaches. Let us suppose that the Hon. Premier is faced with the problem of all the men resigning. Of course, I am not one of those people who believe in indispensability. A lot of friends tell me a lot of things; but they are not of much use when it comes to putting people in jobs. They can criticise; but if you ask them to do the job, they cannot do it.

I know that there are a lot of people in Barbados who are willing to undertake some of these tasks. Running a bus service calls for a lot of courage. A lot of people come and tell me things, but they say that they are not going to say anything because they live in a boarded and shingled house. They also say: "It is all right for you to talk because you drive in a motor car, but I ride a bicycle." If a fellow carries away a battery, the other fellow who knows that that fellow carried away the battery should inform on him. You must have people in your service who are not afraid to get knocked down at night. You have to know how many of these people you have and how well should you pay them. The average Barbadian employer has not yet got around to the idea that proper supervision is worth good pay because it is going to mean a profit to him. In the bus service, you need excellent supervision. You must have excellent supervision so as to get the jobs done well. There is no point in having a lot of people putting on one wheel when that is something which can be done by one man. There is no point in someone taking four hours to do something which can be done in an hour.

3.50 p.m.

The buses run on Sundays, but everybody knows that Sunday is a closed day. We, in the Barbados Workers' Union, do not make the Transport Board pay double time when the employees work on Sundays, although we make other people pay their employees double time for Sundays. In the Estimates you see the sum of \$165,000 for people who are guaranteed six months' holiday with pay, and when you add the services for acting in the Government offices you find that they add up to half a million dollars. In the Transport service, this is not the clerical service; in the Transport Service the boss can go out and another person can hold on for him; in the top layers of management they run a system whereby a man goes on holiday and it does not cost the business anything more. If the stores had to pay on the holiday arrangement just as the Government has to pay, they would have to close down. We all know that in order for a person to get two or three weeks' holiday you have to shift with me and I shift with you on a co-operative basis.

When you come to the Transport Service, these people do not get any extra rate except on Christmas Day. I would like the House and the public to know that, from an industrial point of view, there is nothing extraordinary. We have made an arrangement to pay a bus driver, who is driving a diesel bus, roughly \$5.00 a day. If you can give a man \$20.56 at the lowest, on what basis would you compute the payment of a man who is driving a diesel bus? What do you think a

man who is driving one of these buses should receive? These are people who are meeting the limit of their economic existence. Such people would die as bus drivers unless they were to win a sweepstake. When you make an analysis of these things, you have to say; this is what income tax the transport service is paying into the economy of your island and what plans you have for making it an essential service. I should like to say that anybody would abide with whatever plans you have to make the service efficient. As I said, I have no brief either for the workers or for anybody else up there; I have told the workers that the only way in which they can progress in an era like this is to be efficient.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I must say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter might have dealt with the Transport Board and I find him to be on friendly terms in all of his discussions; but I must commend the Hon. Premier for his statement that not one cent should be given to the Board. I have a little knowledge of transport, and I know that the Transport Board has all the paying routes in Barbados. That being so, the Board should be making money. Instead of asking the Government to give them money every year, they should be returning money. I see absolutely no reason why the Transport Board cannot return money every year. There is indeed a certain amount of sabotage going on up there; can you imagine them buying a bus for \$22,000 and then taking parts off that bus in order to make the others good? Mr. Chairman, I feel that a thorough investigation should be made up there; I think that the entire Board should be fired, having regard to what is going on up there. The hon. member who has just sat down must know the facts before he says that the Board should be given more money. I would not give the Transport Board one cent; I would like to see some of them go to prison for what is going on up there.

Mr. WALCOTT: I quite agree with the hon. member, but that is only an emotional splash. What are the facts? I agree that we want the facts. The hon. member should be prepared to say why the people up there should be sent to prison. I have been very dispassionate in my speech, but I am not always that way. I have no axe to grind. I did not deal with the Transport Board other than on a basis which involves my job. I have asked the Government to carry out an investigation into the workings of the Labour Exchange and I brought a name here. If I had a son who is a thief I would ask people to lock him up. If you are a thief, then you must pay the price which a thief must pay; jail was made for thieves and vagabonds. If you hear that something has happened and it turns out that a man has made an improvement, you must allow somebody else to say that.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that any money should be given to the Board; what I say is that for anything you do you must have an investigation. I have said more than what the hon. member who has just sat down has said; I said that if they are satisfied, then we must know. What the hon. member says about their taking off parts of a bus to put on others, that is a thing which happens. As soon as you come to that, then you have no faith in public service. The hon. junior member for St. Michael is a member of a Local Government Authority and they have transport. What I am pointing out is this; I have heard hon. members make speeches and the speeches which they make are the antithesis of their being in public life, because they connote that you do not have any belief in public administration. 4.00 p.m.

The things that we have to administer are not our private property, but we take as much interest in them. Do you think that Barbados would have progressed the way it has if we did not have public administration? Suppose everybody had to go about and catch a catch can, and each man search for himself in public administration, in the House of Assembly or in Local Government, what would happen? When we talk about social security, it is not our money; but do we not administer it and it is a matter of what control and discipline we use? I am not one of those persons who feel glibly that people would buy a new bus and take the parts off that bus and put them on an old one. What the Premier has said is what I know. If a Department comes under criticism, lots of people are always willing to come and tell you lots of things about other people. This was a political Board. I am

not unmindful of why the hon. senior member for St. John wants to fire all these members, but I do not take the same line. These were members appointed by the last Government in the main, but it may be a difficult thing. Maybe if another Government gets into power they would fire the members you appoint. When you fire all the members, it reduces the members of the Board to either stooges or a bunch of crooks.

Mr. Chairman, I am nothing to do with a man's political persuasion. The members of other Parties have different political views than I do, but I do not assume that they are so stupid and at times so dishonest that they would allow a man to do these things. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has a different political persuasion than I do; therefore if you put him on a Board I do not believe that because the money is not his money he would allow a man to buy a bus and pick off the parts to put on an old bus and leave the new bus there without a top to allow the rain to fall into it. That is not indifference and stupidity; that is corruption; so I do not go for that sort of thing, nor do I go for street corner or rumshop politics where people come and tell you everything that is bad under the sun about your opponents. I can listen for hours and hours to people who would not tell me one positive thing to do, but would tell me all the bad things about people they feel are my opponents. All of us must have had the experience of somebody coming and telling us we do not know how much cursing he got for us. I often tell him to let me get some for myself. Everybody will tell you that they will commit murder on your behalf, but you cannot go in for that. I would warn hon. members of the House that they will hear a lot of things on the outside, but when they come here to debate a matter, they have to debate it against a background of facts which they have assessed, and not against the things that somebody working somewhere comes out and tells them, because some people are extremely disloyal to the place or the organisation with which they are working. They want to get to the top, and the only way they can do it is by tearing down honest people at the top, bringing out things and telling politicians what the people are doing.

My answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that as soon as you can bring out things about other people, since you are in a position to get this information, you will do it to me too. If somebody is acting against the public interest, it is a different thing; but as soon as somebody is willing to bring out all these things that happen inside, you should watch him. If I had an administration to run and found that there were disloyal people in it, I would get rid of them fast. There are a lot of disloyal people in the Civil Service. Some people come and tell you news; but because you are the Democratic Labour Party, do not think that that person is any better than the person they are talking about. They are on your side now; but when you are down, they are going to get on the other people's side.

Mr. Chairman, I used to be a member of the Governor-in-Executive Committee in this country, and many a morning I could not wake up. People used to ring me early in the morning. Since the new Government has got into power, lots of people think that I am Madam Lupesco of Rumania, because if you wanted to see King Carol you had to acquaint Madam Lupesco first. Some people have the idea that I am a yard fowl. Because I spoke on somebody's platform, they think I am looking for a Ministry or a Deaconhood. People all over the world know me; so I do not have to flag myself about with a nay-nay Ministry in Barbados so that when you have to pay out pensions we have to cut off three cents here and half a cent there which gives you a headache. I say that because people like bringing news, which is very upsetting for politicians. Politicians cannot ignore everything everybody tells them, and they must at sometimes play deaf, because at the end of all this news, you hear "Well, skipper, you have anything there?" News has its price. If it has not got its small price, next week they are going to tell you that they hear a job is coming up, that you know they are always on your side and they expect you to do your best for them; but if he does not get the job, you are the worst man in the world. Then you might hear somebody saying that he worked for the Minister so many times, but now the Minister does not know him any more. All you gentlemen who have just come in for the first time will get your dose. I have been in

this business long enough to know that your time is going to come. Many of us in this Assembly start election with one bunch of canvassers and before the election is finished, some of them have swung, and when another election comes, one of the chief men whom you think is working for you has lined up on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, all I say is that the Transport Board is a Board which has come in for a lot of beating and it will continue to come in for a lot of beating as long as it is a public service just like the Waterworks Department or the Highways and Transport Department. The Head on Highways and Transport passed in here without a comment, but ten years ago I would still be on that; but it had its purpose. Highways and Transport could not pass in here without a debate lasting for four hours. As far as I am concerned, I am not a Minister and I do not have to defend the Transport Board.

4.10 p.m.

As Secretary of the Trade Union, I do not have to defend the workers in here, but I do so with my limited knowledge of what has been going on and with my more than limited knowledge about transport on an international basis. I know it is going to cost money if the public is going to run it.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, it would be a lack of forthrightness if I did not throw my weight in saying something as regards the transport service of Barbados. I am glad to see that the Hon. Premier has cut off \$149,999 from this Head, Transport Service, and I am sorry that he did not cut off the \$1.00 which he has left in the vote. I say that because this is another dollar which will be going down the drain. I can say that without fear of contradiction. I can say that because it is part of my business to run transport. In my line of business, I have to cater for one job and hope to get another.

The bus service in Barbados is a service which can be made to pay because everybody who gets in a bus must pay cash. You will find that the majority of the bus concessionaires drive school children free in their buses and yet their service pays them. If Mr. Trotman can run his service and make a profit, after paying income tax and trade tax when it is taken into consideration that he has to employ chauffeurs, conductors and inspectors in the same way as the Transport Board, why then cannot the Transport Board make its service pay? That is not so only with Mr. Trotman, but with all of the other concessionaires. I feel that there is dishonesty somewhere along the line in the running of the Transport Board Service; therefore, the quicker you can get rid of it, the better. Every year \$150,000 of the poor taxpayers' money is going down the drain. Instead of letting it go down the drain, some of it can go to the paying of increased salaries to policemen.

Let us take Mrs. Rock. She has the worst route to run; and if she can make a profit, what is the Transport Board doing? They are a bunch of dishonest people. Let the Government free its hands from transport. Let the Transport Board give back the buses to private concessionaires. It will not interfere with the drivers and conductors because there would be still room for them. I am saying that if Mrs. Rock can make a profit and can buy a plantation, something is going wrong with the Transport Board somewhere, especially with the Head of that department. I am sorry that I cannot say the things that I want to say. However, I am here to see that the money of the taxpayers is spent in a proper way.

Hon. members talked and argued a whole day on giving an increase to old age pensioners. These things are only done to retard the progress of this House. All of these things can be rushed through in less time. The hon. senior member for St. Peter may know about trade unionism but when it comes to running transport, I can tell him that from the time I was a child I was familiar with the running of transport. I know about it backwards and forwards. I repeat, if the Transport Board cannot make it pay, let it go. My only regret is that you have left a dollar in these Estimates towards it and I repeat, that is also going down the drain.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I can agree with some of the points of the last hon. member who spoke. I remember

that I told the last Government before it went out of power that the rain was falling and the roof was leaking. I told them, watch and see that the water is leaking out. We were speaking on the Transport Board and the running of transport throughout the Island. It was said then that all the other concessionaires who were running buses had their families working with them and therefore they could make their service pay. Mrs. Rock does not have one child, sister or brother. She has one of the hardest bus services in the Island of Barbados and if Mrs. Rock makes a profit out of it, anybody else in this Island can make a profit out of it.

I am not saying that the Transport Board is not giving a better service than some of the other concessionaires. The Transport Board can give a better service than the other concessionaires because it is receiving all the things which are needed free of cost. We have purchased buses for the Transport Board; we have given them money to buy buses and to pay for everything they want and yet they are still running it at a loss.

I highly commend the Hon. Premier for what he has done by cutting off this \$150,000. I would allow the Transport Board now to run the service for another year but not with any \$150,000 given to them. Let them run it for another year so as to see how much farther down the gully they would go. I am sure that you can give the blindest man the Transport Service in its present state, and with careful running he would save money and put it in the Treasury. But with the present system of running it, I believe that even if you give them free gasoline and free tyres, they would still run it at a loss because they mean to run it at a loss. That is plain for anyone to see. Any man in Barbados knows that the money is squandered. I remember that Mrs. Rock's husband and myself operated the first improved Ford which he had in running the first bus service down St. Andrew and because of bad management, it was run at a loss. I am certain that Mrs. Rock's husband had purchased one bus and after running it at a loss, she took over the service from him and from that one bus I think she has a hundred now. She has been able to do so by careful running of the service.

Sir, I am telling you that any transport service in this Island can make a profit; but as regards the service by the Transport Board the Government will have to look into it. The Government would have to go into it because the cost of living is raised throughout the Island and if it is not but a cent more, the bus fares must be raised. A cent is a lot of money. That would help because the cost of living has gone up; therefore, it goes up for the chauffeurs, the conductors, the mechanics, inspectors and everybody. If the cost of living is raised, everything should be raised to give satisfaction to the majority.

As I have said, I am sure that if you were to give the service run by the Transport Board to either one of the other concessionaires, he will make a profit out of it and will save thousands and thousands of dollars in the Treasury. Under the present system, it seems to me as if some of the bags of the conductors have holes and it seems as if you do not have proper watchmen. If you check on them, you will give a better service to the community. We are giving them everything free. Do you mean to say that with all of that they still run it at a loss?

4.20 p.m.

We have given them everything they have free and yet they cannot run without making a loss; we have given them the power to borrow money. The Government has made provision whereby the Transport Board can borrow money to run the buses. I should like to ask; who lends money to the private concessionaires? Who gives them parts and lends them money? The private concessionaires have to get money from wherever they can get it and be in a position to run adequate services. I am certain that if we only held off the money which the Board feels they want for this one year, we will see how the transport is run. If the Board does not run the transport as it should be run, then we will run them from the transport.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly sure that after what I said on the question of transport yesterday, it

was not necessary for me to say anything more today; but after listening to the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am wondering if we are really looking upon our responsibility towards the public in relation to this matter of transport. All the other territories are obligated to run the transport. I was hoping that the Hon. Premier would have had something further to say on this matter which can be regarded as an indirect means of taxation. This is something which must have been arranged a long time ago and it is bound to mean an increase in failure. Some of us are not really aware of what is taking place, but the development of a country depends to a great extent on the communications. Everybody today relies on transport; all industry relies on transport; do you think what this matter of transport means to the country? Do you think of the children who would be inconvenienced by a dislocation of the service? If any dislocation in the transport service takes place and this Transport Board has to change hands with the Government, do you know the number of routes which would be more or less discontinued? The very argument as to the losses of the Transport Board would justify the reason for an increase in the cost of travelling. I believe that the Premier must have something in his mind about this Board and we have heard that it is being run through one of the Banks in Bridgetown. If the Government is dissatisfied with the running of the Board, then it is a question of examining what is going on there. You can continue to criticise the old Government, but it is a matter of responsibility to the people now.

There is a simple means which can be adopted, that is, you can check up on the Transport Board and see what is going on there. Fortunately, we have a wonderful Manager up there, but if you change hands the Transport service must still go on. You may find that every person who is transported down to town and back has to pay something more. It is my hope that the Hon. Premier has been giving second thought about what has been said in respect of the Transport Board. It is all right for you to say that you have a buggy and you can wash it off on Sundays and keep it running; but when you come to the Transport Board, it is quite a different matter. You must think of replacing units. Mr. Chairman, I am not clear that all of these buses have been paid for. I believe that some of these units still have to be paid for; but all of these things we have been ignorant of. You may just get up and say that they should not throw money down the drain; but when you think of what a dislocation in the transport service is going to mean, you cannot just take an emotional decision because you are thinking of the people who were criticising the last Government. I am saying that a success will be made of the Board. Let us make no mistake about it, if you pass on the running of the Board to somebody else he will make a success of it too. From the notes which were sounded in the speech of the Hon. Premier, apparently a decision was taken before the Estimates were sent to the printers. I appeal to the Government to be very careful about this matter.

The question that the sum of \$1 under Head 31 - Transport Services - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 32 - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Head 32 - Highways and Transport - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,582,329 under Head 32 - Highways and Transport - stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$1,582,329 under Head 32 - Highways and Transport - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, it has been drawn to my attention that Item 14 - Personnel Officer - has been fixed by law. I want to know from the authorities if I can say anything on this Item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Item 14 is fixed by law.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Do you want the Head re-committed?

Mr. BOXILL: I wanted to talk on Item 14 - Personnel Officer.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, ask that the Head be re-committed.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 32 - Highways and Transport - be re-committed.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that.

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

RE-COMMITTAL OF HEAD 32 HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. George being in a hurry to get this run through, because these men are responsible for the item with which I am going to deal.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, let the hon. member call the item to which he is referring.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, when the hon. member refers to "these men", I do not understand it. I am sure he does not know what he wants to discuss in here. Look at what we are up against? This sawed-off stump; this crude political raw material!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is unparliamentary to address the member that way.

Mr. MILLER: This human raw material! This item is fixed by law and the hon. member is referring to the Personnel Officer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas never mentioned that. He is speaking on Head 32 in general.

Mr. MILLER: This dusty ladle of human dross!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and will appeal to hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, dealing with Head 32 which covers Highways and Transport, I would like to draw to the appropriate Minister..... Are you going to sit there, Mr. Chairman, and allow me to be constantly interrupted by everybody in this Chamber? I have a right to speak in here like anybody else and I will not be tolerating that kind of stuff.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. junior member for Thomas alone.

Mr. BOXILL: Dealing with Head 32, I should like to say that there are a lot of discrepancies going on at the Highways and Transport Department, first with the Personnel Officer and with people being appointed to be bosses and getting less money than the people whom they have been appointed to boss. I do not want to lead any personal attack on a Civil Servant because he has not got the right to come here and defend himself when members get and call him all sorts of names.....

I take what the hon. member says in the light in which he said it, because my skin is thick; I am somewhat like a pachyderm, but when I start to retaliate some people cannot take it.

Getting back to the Head, Mr. Chairman, it has been drawn to my attention and, I am sure, to yours that the methods of the particular gentleman in this Department have

been somewhat dictatorial. I remember where on two occasions he has refused to give a worker an increment without notifying that worker. Now the Personnel Officer has a right if he feels justified enough not to give an increment to a worker, but he must also state that reason before he stops this man's increment. This man spends most of his time in pursuing the opposite sex. (Mr. WALCOTT: What do you want the man to do?) I will not be crossed by you. I want to draw these things to the Minister's attention. I have been told that since this Government started its crash programme, this man has carried his invective to the point where he has told people that they have changed the Government and to see how they are going to get work. If he is employed as a Government Officer, I think, irrespective of which Government is in power, he has to give of his best. He should not intimidate the workers. He is not to give people promotion according to how he feels or to his friend or political ally. The hon. senior member for St. George was ready to jump up and defend this piece of legislation, because he knew all about it, and therefore he does not want it to be exposed. When these people go around appointing their yard fowls.....

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

Mr. BOXILL: I beg your pardon, Sir. I meant the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Well then, on a point of order, Sir, I really do not understand the hon. member. First of all, it is improper for the hon. member to speak on this Item which is fixed by law, and I am surprised that he has been allowed to lead a discussion on it; but why did he decide that I would even know this man? It is true I know him as a person, but I had nothing to do with Highways and Transport for him to accuse me. Anyhow, he can go ahead and flog the past Government as it is something that is done on every occasion; but for the hon. member to take advantage, for instance, of the House of Assembly knowing that the servant is unable to defend himself in the Press or even on the telephone and say it is not true, is not only cruel but it is cowardly. It is a rather cowardly act, and I would like to dissuade the hon. member from going any further. It is not a question of my friend or a friend of the Government, because before I joined the Government, he was a Civil Servant.

Mr. BOXILL: If I am a coward, I am proud, but I am a greater coward than the hon. junior member for St. George. I have no apologies to make to the hon. member or to anybody else. I said before that I was sorry I had to accuse the man in here because he cannot come here and defend himself, but what does the hon. member expect me to do? Does he want me to meet the man on the street and tell him these things and let him ignore me? I am drawing this matter to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. George since he says he does not know the man and to the members of my Government.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I said I did not know the behaviour of which he was accusing this Officer. This sawed-off stump! I am not supposed to know of the behaviour or ill-behaviour of which he has accused this Officer. You say you have no apology for me, but I am not asking for an apology. I am only saying what appears to be right. It is all right to take shelter in the House of Assembly, but I suppose we will have to put up with this dross.

Mr. BOXILL: I do not have to take shelter in the House of Assembly, and it will be proven later when something else more tangible comes up for debate.
4.40 p.m.

I have served in the War and for your information, Mr. Chairman, I have the distinction of being the first and only rating to put an officer on a charge. These people went around appointing people who suited their political expediency. I do not mind how much coward I am accused of by making this statement. I do not intend to hide behind anything and accuse Civil Servants; but there are times when we have to do these things in order to bring them to the

proper notice of the people. It is strange enough that the hon. junior member for St. George is going to allow this piece of sawed-off saw material to come now from out at sea to tell him something, but I am not at sea now, and I know what is happening.

I am making a bold statement that men have been appointed at the Department of Highways and Transport who should have never been appointed over the heads of others who should have been appointed. I will go further and say this. I have known of an incident which has taken place at that Department - I am not going to call names - where at one time it was suspected that bribery was used in order to acquire a job. If we are going to stay here as representatives of the people and allow the cries of the people to go unheeded, we would not have served our purpose or justified our cause in going to the electorate and asking the people for their votes.

I am asking the Hon. Minister to have an investigation into the whole transport system and check on some of these things. I do not want to be critical but everybody cannot be wrong. You, Sir, have been told, as I have been, of some of these things that have taken place and as a matter of spite this particular man has become invective because the Party of his liking was not returned to power on December 4th, last.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was quick to point out my error just now, and I thank him for it; but I want him to realise that when I spend eighteen years in here, I hope I would not make half of the mistakes which he or the hon. junior member for St. George has made.

The question that the sum of \$1,528,329, under Head 32, Highways and Transport, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 33 - CIVIL AVIATION

Head 33 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before I move that this Head stand part, I am making an amendment to Item 31, Transportation. The amount of \$14,000 which is to be voted under the Head is to be increased by \$400 making the revised provision now \$14,400.

I beg to move that the sum of \$149,646 under this Head, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 24 - ELECTRICAL INSPECTION

Head 34 - Electrical Inspection - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$13,002 under Head 34, Electrical Inspection, do now stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 35 - LIGHTHOUSES

Head 35 - Lighthouses - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$32,340 under Head 35, Lighthouses, do now stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, now, as regards Head 36, I want to postpone it for now in consequence of the unavoidable absence of the Hon. Minister of Education.

I am therefore asking for leave to postpone Head 36.

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

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Head 27 - Ministry of Social Services - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before I move that this Head stand part, I want to move in a few amendments. Item 10, Emigration Expenses, is to be reduced by \$499; therefore, the revised revision would be \$1.00. The Note is to be deleted and to be substituted by "Token provision".

With that amendment, I beg to move that the sum of \$15,652 under the Head as amended, do now stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister of Social Services whether any consideration is being given to the implementation of coaching services in games and sports other than cricket. I am speaking on Item 11, Coaching Services. It is true to say that there was a time when cricket was almost a religion in Barbados but there are areas where cricket is unknown and when you talk of it, the people ask you what is it.

It is high time that provision should be made for coaching in track and field athletics. It is a very sorry position one can find oneself in where a Barbados born athlete has to be attached to a team in Jamaica or perhaps Trinidad in international competitions. These competitions are witnessed by crowds five or six times larger than what attend cricket matches. I speak now of one of our athletes, John Wedderburn, who was trained in the U.S.A. and who had the distinction of journeying to Rome to take part in the Olympic games there, and during these games, the attendances were over one million. There are other athletes of even greater potential and what they need is proper coaching.

4.50 p.m.

Therefore, I am asking if the Hon. Minister would consider allocating a sum of money so that some competent coach might come to this Island of Barbados and give his services to us whereby our athletic potentiality may be released. Mr. Chairman, I can think of one or two persons who have offered their services in this direction; they are willing to come here and coach our athletes free, gratis and for nothing if only their travelling allowance will be paid. We know that cricket is a game of the highest importance; it is played in the British Commonwealth, but the British Commonwealth is not the world by any means.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I should like to inform him that the question of coaching in other fields of sport is at present engaging the attention of my Ministry, and we are hoping that something tangible will be done in the not too distant future. I may say here and now that there are one or two offers which have been made to me by people who are interested in carrying on coaching here in Barbados, and these offers are presently being dealt with in the Ministry. I would be very grateful if the hon. junior member for the City would pass on to me the offers which were made to the Barbados Athletic Association which he represents and I will promise to have something done about it as soon as time and occasion will permit.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am indeed very grateful to the Hon. Minister of Social Services for his courteous reply, and I will undertake to pass on to him such information as I have in due course. However, I

would point out that the Minister must realise the great importance of athletics in the world scene. There are many people in the world who did not know that there was a place called Jamaica until Jamaica was represented at the Olympics; and I daresay that many people do not know Barbados and they will ask you where and what is Barbados. There is a great opportunity therefore for placing Barbados on the international map through games, other than cricket, which have an international appeal. The appeal for cricket is limited to those matches which take place in the British Commonwealth, but athletics have a universal appeal. There is every probability of a visiting team of athletes to Tokyo in the year 1964. There are nine West Indian athletes who were trained in the United States of America; they were students in the United States - which shows the necessity for training if athletic potentiality is to be released. I am hoping that something will be done for the benefit of these athletes some of whom are taking part in the athletic competitions between the most important of our schools.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. member knows quite well that I am one of those persons in this Island of Barbados who is very keenly interested in athletics. As a matter of fact, it was through the impetus given me by him that I played such an important part in athletics in Barbados, although I am not an athlete myself. For that reason, I saw fit not to commit myself to Weymouth or the use of Weymouth by any particular individual, although certain oral representations were made to me by various branches of the Civil Service for the use of Weymouth. I feel that Weymouth could be better used as a training ground for our athletes, and I made it quite clear and plain to all those who made necessary representations to the Ministry and to me personally, that Weymouth is going to be used as a training centre for athletes. That being so, it would not be fair to give the use of Weymouth to any particular organisation such as the Police Sports Club or the Civil Service Association and thereby deny other thousands of boys and girls the privilege of using this ground. I may say that at the present time there are plans to have Weymouth enclosed whereby the trainees will not be disturbed by whosoever will. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that these few humble remarks are enough to satisfy the hon. junior member for the City and the other members of this Chamber that something is being done about the promotion of the growth of athletics in this Island of Barbados.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am aware and highly appreciative of the remarks made by the Hon. Minister and of his interest in sport; but as a result of several unhappy experiences with predecessors I want to get it on record; as they say in the United States of America, always get it in writing.

The question that the sum of \$15,652 under Head 37 - Ministry of Social Services - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (1)

DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

Head 38 - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$70,816 under Head 38 - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$70,816 under Head 38 - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head 38 - Medical (2) - General Hospital - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,237,240 under Head 38 - Medical (2) General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$1,237,240 under Head 38 - Medical (2) - General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head 38 - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$270,382 under Head 38 - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$270,382 under Head 38 - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (4) LAZARETTO

Head 38 - Medical (4) Lazaretto - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$19,415 under Head 38 - Medical (4) Lazaretto - stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$19,415 under Head 38 - Medical (4) Lazaretto - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (5) DISTRICT HOSPITAL SERVICES

Head 38 - Medical (5) District Hospital Services - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$25,720 under Head 38 - Medical (5) District Hospital Services stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$25,720 under Head 38 - Medical (5) District Hospital Services - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (6) HEALTH CENTRES

Head 38 - Medical (6) Health Centres - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$162,389 under Head 38, Medical (6) Health Centres, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$162,389 under Head 38 - Medical (6) Health Centres - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (7) MATERNITY HOSPITAL

Head 38 - Medical (7) Maternity Hospital - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$23,349 under Head 38 - Medical (7) Maternity Hospital stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$23,349 under Head 38 - Medical (7) Maternity Hospital - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 - PROBATION SERVICE

Head 39 - Probation Service - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$5,332 under Head 39 - Probation Service - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, we on this side would appreciate a certain amount of deceleration in these matters.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I ask the hon. member for what reason.....

The question that the sum of \$5,332 under Head 39 - Probation Service - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - OLD AGE PENSIONS

Head 40 - Old Age Pensions - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this Head there are a couple of amendments which I am asking leave to make. In the first place, there is Item 7 "Old Age Pensions" and the amount is to be increased by the sum of \$130,000. You will see, Mr. Chairman, that the amount to be voted previously was \$1,118,000 and with this increase of \$130,000 the revised provision will now be \$1,248,000. Then the corresponding Note "Pensions Increase from \$1.80 to \$2.15 per week" is to be deleted and the following note to be substituted therefor: "provision to pay pensions at \$2.40 per week." Further down, there is Item 10 "Claims Committees fees"; the amount there of \$7.50 is to be increased by \$2.10 making the total revised provision \$9.60.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that the sum of \$1,253,034 under Head 40 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$1,253,034 under Head 40 - Pensions - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.00 p.m.

HEAD 41 - SOCIAL WELFARE

Head 41 - Social Welfare - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$24,226 under Head 41 - Social Welfare - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: For me to speak on this Head, Mr. Chairman, I would have to look for an item not fixed by law. I have expressed my sentiments already on this matter, but I am not sure that the Leader of the House was here. This used to be my hardy annual when I had somebody to flog, but thank God she has retired. I do not speak now in the same strain nor do I speak with the same feeling. I have a great regard for the Head of this Department, but I believe her services could be better used in another Department. I am serious about this, because there is a tremendous lot of overlapping.

Mr. Chairman, speaking on Item 9, I feel, as I have said before, that there is a tremendous lot of overlapping with the Social Welfare Department, and you should make a serious attempt to re-organise that Department so that in some way or other you can save money. Perhaps you can scrap this whole Department. I do not say this with a view to putting anybody out of work because they could be used in another Department in the Service. Trinidad scrapped this Department long ago. This was brought to us, I believe, at the beginning of the War when it was felt that there were young people here in this Island willing to do social welfare work.

I cannot see your having a Probation Department, a Social Welfare Department and a Public Assistance Board,

because this gives the idea of spending money all the time. I feel that there should be some co-ordination. Can you imagine having this Department and a Public Assistance Board controlled by Mr. Hutson Williams? (A VOICE: You do not like Hutson Williams.) He never pulled anything out of my hand. I heard the remark, Mr. Chairman, that I do not like Hutson Williams; he is a gentleman. I never ran in St. Peter; so I have no reason to dislike him. You are spending money all the time in the way the last Government did, and it is time that you look seriously into this matter of the Social Welfare Department and, if necessary, abandon it altogether.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to hear the Minister on this, because if there is one Department which you must continue and continue to improve, it is this Department, and you are probably thinking in terms of changing the name from Social Welfare to "Community Development". It is all right to refer to what is happening in Trinidad, but in all the Institutions there is a Social Welfare Officer attached, and I am sure that Eric Williams will tell you that he made a great mistake when he closed that Department, because all over Port-of-Spain and all over Trinidad there are riot gangs who shoot and what have you. When you think of a Social Welfare Department whether in coin or in kind, in a developing community like ours, it is very vital. I hope the Minister will say something on this.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether consideration is being given to the appointment of more Sports Officers in this community. There are 126 elementary schools which this Officer is supposed to administer, not to mention the 4,000 odd children in the Government-maintained secondary schools. That is a monumental task which no man can possibly fulfil. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this lone Sports Officer is supposed to operate without sports equipment and that is not good enough. Even in the neighbouring colonies with small budgets, sports equipment has been voted for by the Governments of those countries and an attempt is made to train the youth of the community in both track and field athletics; but here it is: we have a single Sports Officer who is supposed to take care of 126 elementary schools, not to mention the Government-maintained secondary schools.

This is a token appointment, Mr. Chairman, because no one man could ever perform that job, never mind how energetic he might be; and we do have a very interested and energetic Sports Officer at the moment, but he must become frustrated when he finds he has no assistance in the monumental task which faces him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I support the hon. member and I think the Minister will want to say something on this. He will remember that when we created a Sports Officer in the Social Welfare Department, it was a question of funds, and it is my unchanging hope that the Minister will consider the possibility of increasing the staff particularly in that Department. The importance of a Social Welfare Department in a developing community like ours certainly is vital.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister answers, I hope he has been listening carefully. The main point I have been making is the co-ordination of the several Departments under the Social Welfare Department. You could either have a proper Social Welfare Department bringing in all the other Departments, or abandon this. If you look through the Estimates, you will see the various Departments that come under Social Welfare and I guess at the moment that the most the Minister can say is that he will give it consideration.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City, no one can put in my mouth what I should say. I know what I am doing, I know what I propose to do, and I know what I will do as long as I have health and strength.

First of all, in answering the question of bringing all the Departments - Social Welfare, Public Assistance and Probation Department - together, I would like to let the

hon. senior member for the City know that that is not part of my policy. I may feel like the hon. senior member for the City; I may feel that not all that could be done in this Department is being done; I may feel there is more work to be done by the Probation Department, and I may feel that there is more to be done by the Social Welfare Department; but when we break it down and see the work that is supposed to be done by the Probation Department and the Social Welfare Department, we cannot incorporate the two as one. The Probation Department is there to deal with the discharge of matrimonial cases.

5.10 p.m.

You know there is the Bastardy Act and you know what part the Probation Office plays in dealing with bastardy cases. The Probation Department is also there to deal specifically with statutory bodies as regards juvenile and adult offenders. That is the work of the Probation Department.

As regards a breakdown of the work of the Social Welfare Department, you find that that Department deals with group work and liaison work in connection with emigrants. Let us say that a minor is leaving Barbados. It is the duty of the Social Welfare Department to make sure that when that minor leaves Barbados to go to England it is well taken care of, and does not fall into the hands of - I do not know whether I should say - wolves.

The Social Welfare Department is also there to look after handicraft development, community development and so on. I would like to make this clear. When it is said that nothing or very little is done in the Social Welfare Department, I may agree with the hon. senior member for the City if he said that nothing has been done in the past or that enough has not been done. But I would like to point out to the hon. senior member for the City that there has been a great acceleration of work done in the Social Welfare Department recently and more is going to be done. As a matter of fact, the plans which I have for that Department, when they are implemented, are going to cause great concern among a great number of my friends. It may cause a battle of words, as I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter make mention of this morning. I would like to assure the hon. senior member for the City that there are great plans for that Department. As a matter of fact, I feel that the other Departments should have nothing to do with the Social Welfare Department, if the Social Welfare Department performs the duties which it should perform and I am going to see that this is done and that there is a separate Department for sport. I am sure the hon. junior member for the City would agree with me there.

I think now that I have pointed out the functions of the Probation Department and the Social Welfare Department that hon. members can see that there is no overlapping.

The hon. senior member for the City spoke of wastage or money spent in a stupid way. That might have been true, but I can assure him, if that was done in the past, that I would see to it that it is not done now and it will not be done during the time I am carrying this portfolio. The Social Welfare Department has handicraft development as one of its branches and I must say that that Department is bringing a considerable amount of revenue to this island of Barbados and furnishing work for people. Some young ladies receive as high as \$18 a week for smocking. It is also training some of our young people to become skilled workers in some field or the other.

With reference to the question raised by the hon. junior member for the City in connection with the coaching services, I would just like to say that I have been too busy in the short time which I have been in the Ministry to get around to implementing a plan which I have in view for the sports section of my portfolio. I really do not like bringing tales out of school, and I usually flog children when they bring tales out of school; but I can assure the hon. junior member for the City that I have been giving that matter quite a lot of thought. I, myself, am not satisfied with one Sports Officer having to visit the 126 elementary schools all over the Island, because the sort of programme which

we would like to put over cannot be put over by one Sports Officer. That is as far as I would go. I would like to point out that in as much as I have been kept busy – and I know many hon. members know that I have been kept busy – with the Health Section of my portfolio, as soon as I can get the unhappiness erased from that section of my portfolio which I hope will be very soon, I will be able to implement the programmes which I have for sports and community development in this Island. I do not know if what I have said has satisfied the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister very much but apparently, he believed that I was firing a joke at him. You do not have a Civil Servant who can stop me from attacking him if I feel that he should be attacked. I merely asked why should you have all these Departments, a Probation Department, a Social Welfare Department, a Public Assistance Department? What I am saying is that there is a sort of co-ordination in the services of your Probation Department, the Old Age Pension Department and your Social Welfare Department. Any time you have services like that, they can be co-ordinated. I have come to the conclusion that you have a Government which can think. You have told me what those Departments are doing; but I am telling you that it would take you a long time to acquire the knowledge which I have. Let me tell you that one of the first things which caused me to get up against the Social Welfare Department was when they came in here for \$6,000 to bring back young women from England. That was an occasion when the present Minister of Trade challenged the Government also. A South African woman was then in charge of that Department.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, what I am coming to is this: as a matter of fact, any members who do not want to criticise you are not your friends and they do not understand you. Social Welfare is something which must be looked after in any community. If you are giving any thought to Social Security at all, you will put Old Age Pensions under a proper Head. As to the probation service, who outside the Mental Hospital would not agree that this Department has improved? Are you going to pay attention to co-ordinating these Departments?

As to the question of looking after young women who are going to England, I will tell you that the Department has prevented young women from going to England. When you talk about looking after bastardy, tell me if half of one per cent of them were looking after that. Tell me that you are setting up somebody and putting him over the head of the Social Welfare Department whose duty is to look after these things. If the hon. member were to have a private talk with me, he would be able to understand what I am trying to put over. If I wanted to criticise anything, I would do that and then get into my car and go home; on the other hand, whenever I have anything to say I will say it in this House. I am not one of these social climbers; I know where I got my votes from. However I am absolutely certain that this Government is bound to see the wisdom in what I am saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to curtail any debate but we want to get on. I have asked the Clerk to make a note of the matter raised by the hon. member so that we can go into it. His point is that he wants these departments co-ordinated under one head.....

Mr. MILLER: Is the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour taking over from the Minister of Social Services all the time?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the hon. junior member for St. George that I do not have to depend upon anybody to come to my help. Yesterday the hon. member said that I have to depend upon somebody to come in here and come to my rescue. I want to tell the hon. member that I have been taking care of myself from the time that I was 15 years of age. I just want to remind the hon. senior member for the City that the Hon. Premier has pointed out already that it is the policy of the

Government to integrate various Ministries so that they would come under one Head.

The question that the sum of \$24,226 under Head 41 – Social Welfare – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 42 – PRISONS

Head 42 – Prisons – was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$70,956 under Head 42 – Prisons – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 27 "Prisoners Earning Scheme" – I did have something to say on that yesterday. Some people are yet to understand why it is (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, is this a small sub-Committee at work next to me? However, Sir, a reduction has been made in connection with this Item. If it is your aim to have modern trends, what is more (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What reduction?) In the Premier's Speech not long ago.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am not quite clear as to what the hon. member means. Does he mean the amount voted last year.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I remember the remarks made by the Hon. Minister a few minutes ago. The hon. member seems to be taking over.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not taking over anything. I am seeking information as to what the hon. member is talking about. The hon. member said that some remarks were made about a reduction of this Item; we have the Estimates before us and I want to know what the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. MILLER: During the discussion on the Estimates, some reference was made to and I asked the Hon. Minister if he would explain this figure of \$2,005. I want to know if the idea was to remove it and later on it was removed. I may say that the Hon. Minister need not get irritable because he knows that he cannot get irritable with me. The hon. Leader of the House is taking over from the Hon. Minister of Social Services everyday. The Hon. Minister of Development must understand that he was with me in here for over 14 years.

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

I have been looking through the Items and cannot find on which Item the hon. member is speaking.

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on Item 27. During last year we used \$2,500 and I want the Minister to tell me whether he had any change in mind. This is the Minister's responsibility and if you want to make sport, the Minister is not in the mood for that kind of sport. Have I not the right to ask something because the Leader of the House is anxious to get through with the Estimates? In the last two years you could not prevent him from filibustering, and the same member took us to 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning; so why doesn't the Leader of the House stop quarrelling with members in Parliament?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. junior member for St. George to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: You have a special Committee Meeting going on over there and the Leader of the House is interrupting all the time. Anyhow, Sir, I want to know whether or not there is going to be any change.

The question that the sum of \$70,956 under Head 42 – Prisons – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 43 — PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Head 43 — Public Assistance — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$4,245 under Head 43 — Public Assistance — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, do not try rushing things with me. I am addressing my remarks to the Minister of Social Services and I am sure he will follow me. Under Public Assistance you have an amount here, and this will bring home what I was trying to point out to the Minister. All the Public Assistance Officers and your Social Welfare Officer must sit under the Chief Public Assistance Officer where he becomes her boss and tell her what to do, instead of giving her the right to make recommendations to him. I am only throwing these things out to the Hon. Minister to show him my reasons for the suggestion of co-ordination and the saving of expense to the taxpayers. I am a member of this Board. You appointed a Social Welfare Officer who is supposed to be head of the Social Welfare Department, and as a matter of fact, I say to you that the question asked by the former Minister concerning ex-convicts and so on should be taken up and dealt with by the Social Welfare Department. You will see therefore that when I talked about co-ordinating all these Departments, I meant well when I suggested it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I raised a point during the second reading speech and now I am going to show you under Public Assistance what I meant. The hon. senior member for the City went around the subject too much and too long and made people lose the sense of what he was saying. I am going to emphasise what he has said. If you are going to use the same people you have for so much administration, I will say that this is a little half cent place within the context of size and money, and the hon. senior member for the City is the cause of having a Public Assistance Board in Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is a serious accusation. The hon. senior member for St. Peter whom I consider to be one of my best friends, though our political ideologies differ, made a serious accusation of me. Is he suggesting that I caused the Government of Barbados to appoint a Public Assistance Board and appoint Hutson Williams as Chairman?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, tell the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the two of us are good friends, but with a different political philosophy, and that is why I can tell him so. If there is anybody to be blamed for Hutson Williams, it is the hon. senior member for the City. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why?) Down at the City Council he is the Governor-General. The last Government wanted to stop him spending a few *nay-nay* cents, and they appointed somebody to watch him spending them. They appointed a Public Assistance Board of which he is a member and they put a man who did not gain a seat here as Chairman, though they said they did not want politicians on this Board. I like the Africans, Mr. Chairman, because if we were in Africa we would tear up this. The Premier came down here and all these members got hot in their collar when he said he was not going to give one cent for the buses, but I know before the year is out he will give money for the buses or the people will walk. A former Premier got here and said he would not give one cent over his dead body. He has not died and the fares have gone up. He said he was not going to give them any money, and thought that the bus owners were calling a bluff when they said they would not run the buses, and in the morning none of the buses went on the road and the Government found themselves having to run the buses.

Mr. Chairman, you have a Public Assistance Board, but what examination have you made of it? What are you paying out \$20,000 for? You just had a Local Government Commissioner appointed somewhere. You should put him

somewhere or pension him off and let him go home. Tell me what the Local Government Commissioner is doing in Barbados other than running around at meetings and watching members sit down to keep a meeting. He is a big Minute man and you are paying him \$600 a month. I have to work hard in Barbados, and any man working outside of Government for \$600 has to shoot a lot of labour. Barbados is the only place where a man can get \$600 or \$700 and blow a comb. You have a Local Government Commissioner looking around the parishes which are begging for money, and you are paying him \$600 to watch beggars. If the last Government did it, you have to be brutal. Do you think anybody could get me to bring down Estimates with Public Assistance in it? To do what? There in Country Road they have nothing to do, but look what you are doing now: allowing \$2,500 for travelling expenses. That is for people to ride around the country looking around *nay-nay* almshouses in St. Lucy, giving 75 cents here, 18 cents there, 1/6 here and a little old bed there, and two pillows here; that is what you call Public Assistance. Or you have somebody going around to see an old lady who is ill and giving her a little cold-drawn oil; somebody giving 18 cents to buy candle grease, or if the old lady says she has rheumatism when the rain falls, you give her a few phensic tablets. That is the sort of thing you have big men travelling around in a motor car and drawing travelling allowance to do.

Mr. Chairman, you have a Chief Public Assistance Officer and two Public Assistance Officers in that Department drawing travelling allowance, and they are supplied with motor cars. Do you have interests in McEneaney, Cole & Company or the Courtesy? All this foolishness increases the administrative cost.
5.40 p.m.

I put it to any Minister over there that there are not three Departments in the whole Island when it comes to the 31st of the month that you can go in and find ten cents left to the travelling vote. They burst the travelling vote just as Jessie Owens bursts the tape. You are encouraging people to utilise Government's money.

Nobody can come and tell me that a lot of Civil Servants are holding up severance pay. The Government does not make anybody pay severance pay. I know that you are converted to a lot of these things. Mr. Smith is supposed to be Chief Public Assistance Officer. He was a man working in the Courts and you can appoint him as a Magistrate. It does not take any special qualified person to give anybody seven days' imprisonment or to impose a fine of fourteen shillings. In the past, a lot of people were sent to gaol by magistrates who were not lawyers or solicitors. You are now bringing people from all about to act as magistrates. He would not lock up any more people wrongfully than who were locked up wrongfully before.

Sir, where I agree with the hon. member entirely is that not only should there be co-ordination on the part of Ministries so as to abolish some, but there should also be co-ordination of some of these Departments. You have the Local Government Commissioner appointed now as Chief Establishment Officer. You should take the opportunity, when a man leaves a job and you do not need another person in the Department like his not to fill the vacancy; and when the time comes, you can close the Department down. The girls in a Department do not worry you; they cannot claim abolition pension. See what you can do and save us some money. I am saying that by doing this, not only would you save us some money, but you would also get rid of some of these Departments.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services said that it was not his intention to co-ordinate these Departments. Before we had ministerial system, do you realise that the Chief Secretary carried on all these Departments under his Department? Now you have Ministers, you should co-ordinate all of these Departments. In Barbados what the Ministers must understand is that the Ministry of Labour in Great Britain has more people in it than what you have as the population of Barbados. See how many people work in the Ministry of Labour in England! Look at the various numbers of Departments that are attached to it! Now, when it comes

to this Island of Barbados, you cannot co-ordinate three Departments; you cannot co-ordinate three people! You have Crown Law Officers, you have a Crown Solicitor and you cannot co-ordinate them. As soon as you have a Sports Department, the Head of that Department would want somebody along with him, a typist and somebody to bring along his book for him. He is going to want all those people, so what are you going to do about it? When you have all these top Civil Servants, you have to pay them relatively good salaries. You will find one getting \$5,760, the other getting \$6,240 and you get that sort of salary being paid out because nowadays we do not pay less than that. As a matter of fact, nowadays, you find every fellow working so as to get into the \$1,000 bracket. Everybody's aim today is to get \$1,000 a month at least as salary.

We are trying to point out to you that with the prevailing situation today there is no need for Public Assistance as a separate department in Barbados. Do you realise that in some big countries they have more people than our population to pay public assistance to? Sometimes, they have to block off a street. You want to repeat in Barbados all of the names that they have in big countries. You want by itself a Public Assistance Department, a Probation Department and a Social Welfare Department! You have a Crown Solicitor and another person in an office and that is what you call a Department.

You have a man here now by the name of Dr. von Gersdorff. Call him in and let him sit down around a table with you and examine it as a matter of policy to know whether you would want a Local Government Department by itself and a Public Assistance Department by itself. It is just like here where you have seven Ministers and yet you have a Governor and you say that he is only a figure head; he has no power. If that is so, you can get rid of him.

You have Local Government and you have your Local Government Commissioner. I have been to the Bridgetown City Council. What is the use of a Local Government Commissioner going down there with any person like the hon. senior member for the City presiding? He is the Commissioner, Governor-General, the Archbishop and everything down there. What can the Local Government Commissioner go down there and tell him? If you wanted to see how the hon. senior member for the City runs things and presides down there, you should have gone and seen him when he was Mayor. You did not have to ask who was in charge. Therefore, if anybody goes down there and interferes with him, there would be a lot of row. The Local Government Commissioner may go to the other two District Councils.

I repeat that you should wipe out those two Departments - Local Government and Public Assistance. What are you paying Permanent Secretaries for if you are going to have all of these half-cent people? The Permanent Secretary should be the Local Government Commissioner so that he could come back to the Premier and tell him what to do. That is the sort of work which can be done from Headquarters quite easily. Do you believe if anybody is carrying away money somewhere that the Local Government Commissioner can tell you something? Do you think he can tell anybody not to give somebody a yard of cloth? Therefore, I feel quite seriously that we can save a lot of money if Barbados is removed from these things. When you remove these things, you create an attitude in the people's minds that we are out - those of us in here - to do something. There is no use a man entering politics when he does not know anything about administration.

While I am on this, permit me to ask the hon. junior member for St. George to give me back my book which I lent him. Earl Attlee dealt with administration from the time he started to work. I lent the hon. member that book and it seems to me, if he read it, that it went through one ear and came out through the other. I say that, because that book by Earl Attlee deals with all the ministries from the time he was Paymaster General; and I want to say to the young Ministers that when they go into a place they can feel if the Head of a Department is an administrative officer, although Ministers ought not to interfere with the adminis-

tration. You can tell by the way his pulse is moving. 5.50 p.m.

You can tell if he is high-powered or if he is low-powered or neutral. If a man is hitting neutral all the time, you cannot ask him to make a decision for you. There are times when a Minister has to depend on the decisions of people put to him. The Ministers cannot go into every detail, and therefore we want an active administration. I have found out - and it is a sad commentary on West Indian politicians - that many of the Ministers do not know bull-foot about administration, and in that case the Civil Servants can take them for a ride. Despite what has been said about Dr. Eric Williams, he has made the Civil Servants come around to his method and he has got production. In Barbados there is too much of this idea about people of long service; there is too much of this idea of how long a person was there in relation to what he knows.

Mr. Chairman, this is no criticism of any person as a person; but there is no point in building up an administrative department where in the Department itself people do not come up to that greater efficiency and production which we need. The Government is committed to bringing down these things in the Estimates. Examine them in June and let us know if all the unnecessary departments would be taken out after a close examination. When you come to "Subsidies and Grants" which you will have to administer in a different way, you will see that what I am saying is a fact. You give some of these Departments \$25,000 and they are not administering anything, but collecting information which can be collected in the Ministries. If you want another Assistant Secretary, you can put one to do a certain job and cut out all of these unnecessary departments.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Public Assistance Board, I am surprised that the hon. member did not make any mention of this. In Barbados some years ago after a long effort by a number of experts, we got a Local Government Act set up. It was agreed by an Act of Parliament that such a Department should be set up and we may be worried about spending \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$50,000. On the question of Old Age Pensions we spend about \$1 1/4 million and it may well be \$2 1/2 million on poor relief by the three different Local Government Councils. No where in the modern world, I would like to say, would you see public assistance being dispensed by a politician. It all becomes a voting machine. In Trinidad you have a good scheme being administered there and it would be a good thing if the Hon. Minister could go to Trinidad and see how the system is working. We have a building in Country Road and this Department will collect for itself the information which it requires. In the City I am quite sure that the figure is over \$1 million in poor relief and hon. members can correct me if the figure is \$3/4 million. If you are worrying about the expenditure of \$20,000 or more than that for the operation of a Department when everybody is in agreement that you should pool your resources - this was the whole point of the debate yesterday.

The essential thing about this Department is that you should cease to have this matter of poor relief dispensed by any politician. As I have already said, there is nowhere in the modern world where that is done. Unlike the dispensation handled by the eleven vestries in the past, we now have three different Councils looking after this matter. This may be somewhat personal but it involves a lot of trouble by way of communications. Sometimes you will find that it is easier to ride into town, than get a bus and go out to the country. I repeat that we should abolish this idea of \$2 million or more being dispensed by any politicians. That is wrong for every reason on earth. If the Hon. Minister is worrying about the question of cost, that is a concern at the moment, but we have the responsibility. If you think of the amount involved in another two years - surely you will be dealing with a tremendous sum and you will need a Department which cannot be handled by any Clerk. That must be done by a Department.

The question that the sum of \$4,245 under Head 43 - Public Assistance - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 44 — MINISTRY OF DEVELOPMENT, TRADE, INDUSTRY AND LABOUR

Head 44 — Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$314,714 under Head 44 — Ministry of Development, Trade Industry and Labour — stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$314,714 under Head 44 — Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 45 — LABOUR

Head 45 — Labour — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In connection with this Head, Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make an amendment. I am asking that Item 13, "Incidentals, 1565," be increased by \$949, making a revised provision of \$2,514.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$889,953 under Head 45 — Labour — stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$889,953 under Head 45 — Labour — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 46 — CONTROLS, SUBSIDIES, ETC.

Head 46 — Controls, Subsidies, etc., — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$301,618 under Head 46 — Controls, Subsidies, etc., — stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of \$301,618 under Head 46 — Controls, Subsidies, etc., stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.00 p.m.

HEAD 47 — SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on page 150 under Item 38 — Family Planning Association — the amount appearing in the Estimates to be voted is \$20,000. This amount is to be reduced by \$5,000, so that the amount now to be voted will be \$15,000.

I beg to move that the sum of \$924,690 under Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, under Item 45 — District Councils — \$172,000 is to be voted for District Councils, and the note says that the expenditure on parish highways from this Item will be subject to approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I know that some of the District Councils still continue to operate the roads. In St. Peter, the parish which I have the privilege and honour to represent, they are still doing roads, and in St. Philip and St. George — and I think there are some other parishes — the Councils do the roads; but the time will come, Mr. Chairman, when these people who grow too old will retire and get their pensions in the normal course. Road making has become a scientific thing, and you have a lot of ex-

penditure and a lot of machinery at the Highways and Transport Department, and there is no point in continuing to fiddle about now with the tar throwing business you have in many of these parishes.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to take the Minister to some of the districts in my parish to show him some of the roads that can be dealt with by the Central Government. St. Michael does not carry any more road rollers. That is the big metropolitan area and they have supplies that could have carried the roads on the basis of its own economy, and they would have been better able to do it. All the roads in St. Michael are done by Highways and Transport; all the roads in St. Lucy are done by them and it is a good thing that the roads in St. Andrew are done by H. & T. because that is an extraordinary spot. I do not think there is any point in wasting time in duplicating equipment and the cost of equipment. It is true that Highways and Transport help the parishes, but I think the time has come that you should revise this whole idea about roads under the District Councils.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 49 — Tourist Board — I am sorry the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not here because he is the Tourist Board representative. You are voting \$1/2 million for the Tourist Board, and I said in this Island before the election that I think you should co-ordinate your services in Barbados and have a Development Council, something of a more positive character where you can discuss development on a wider basis, bringing in wide elements in the community. I think the Premier is aware that only last month or in January there was a meeting of the Development Council in the United Kingdom and the Trade Union entered it reluctantly. I do not know if they refused on the basis that they might not be willing to work with the present Government. In the United States of America, President Kennedy has set out Councils and Bodies to look into the question of the type of development you have to think about in 1962, and I wonder to what extent the Tourist Board is going to continue to be kept in isolation. You do not have any proper co-ordinating policy, and I think that these are things which the Government should give new meaning and new thinking to, so that the community will get the sort of vitality it requires from this type of subvention.

Mr. Chairman, if you are going to give a Board a subvention as high as \$1/2 million, then you have to think in positive terms to know that the contribution you are going to make is something worthy and worthwhile. \$1/2 million to the Tourist Board is nothing to sneeze at. This is the highest single contribution you are giving to any organisation; so I am hoping that we may be able to hear from the Government what are their views when they are dealing with the Development Board and actual development. This whole question comes within the context of these things because they work in close collaboration.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, after listening carefully to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I must let him know that the employees in the Council are demanding similar wages to Government employees. That means, Sir, that the Council must look for additional money. It is true, Sir, that the Council has not got the money and we would have to appeal to the Central Government for help, because you do not expect the Central Government to pay their employees reasonable salaries while the Local Government pay their employees starvation wages. It is my opinion, therefore, that this Government will have to consider the matter and do their utmost on behalf of the Council. It is also my opinion that Highways and Transport has more than they can shew.

In the parish which I represent there are approximately 50 tenantry roads or more to be built. If you turn over the Department for which Local Government is responsible to Highways and Transport, I can assure you that it will take another generation before you get good roads in my parish, and the people are expecting from us, the members of this Government, roads, water and electricity. It is my opinion, therefore, that we should not turn over that Department to Highways and Transport.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I think really that the time has come when the only possible way Government can help the poor people in the Northern District parishes is for Government to see its way to take over all the roads in the Island and bring them under one Head so that every man would share alike. I understand that there will be machinery imported into this Island by this same Government which would be able to surface the road at cheaper cost. If we wait patiently, I believe that when that machinery goes into operation, it would be of great help to the whole Island. If you have the work done under the supervision of the Department of Highways and Transport, with proper supervision, I am sure we would get a better job.

I was passing through St. Thomas on a routine visit two weeks ago and I saw stones being dropped. They were what you would call six-inch and seven-inch stones. I took up four pieces of that stone and put them in a car and carried them and showed the highway authorities the type of stones they were receiving for three-inch stones. I am sure that if you were surfacing roads with three-inch stones, it would go further than surfacing it with seven inch stones. Therefore, I will advise the Government to take over the entire lot of roads and run it under Central Government. I am certain that we would get a better job.

Sir, there are poor people who are suffering in my district with the reaping of their cane crops. At the present time they cannot cut their canes because they cannot get them out. On Monday morning last, the first job I had to work on was in Mount Hillaby. Sir, it will bless your heart to see how nice the canes are in that district. Some of the people receive from 54 tons to 60 tons of canes per acre, but they cannot get them reaped because there is no road to get them out. The situation has been so bad in recent times that I have advised the people to plant food crops instead of planting canes. I trust that in the future the Government will do its best and I believe my Government has it under consideration to do the most it can in order to help the people in that area to plant more canes and I know the time is coming when my Government is going to take up my case.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 49, Tourist Board. I wonder what justification there is for allowing the Tourist Board a vote of \$500,000. I notice that this is the biggest vote under this Head. I do agree that we have to develop the Tourist Industry because for all the years we have been depending on King Sugar; but, as it was explained only yesterday, we are going to have a surplus of 36,000 tons of sugar to sell on the World Market. However, I do not see the justification for this \$1/2 million being spent on the Tourist Board.

When tourists come to Barbados, it is true to say that they spend some of their money in the stores; but the people who work in those stores are not given any incentive or are not paid more for overtime. We cannot afford to spend \$1/2 million just to please a small minority. I have been told by a reliable source that on an occasion, two Sundays ago, a tourist ship came here and, as you know, by law the stores must be closed on Sundays and bank holidays, which would mean that the stores would not have been able to open to accommodate that tourist ship. When these tourists go to the hotels they are charged exorbitant fees. They have to pay something like 10% interest on what they buy. This money goes into some puzzling box which they keep at the hotel, but nine out of ten times the servants do not get their full due out of this box. I know on more than one occasion of cases in which the management shares in this extra pay. The management should not share in this because I think it is what is called service tax. I do not see any reason why managers should share in this service tax. It is unfair to the workers.

Another thing is this. Quite a number of these hotels are discriminating against these tourists by closing their doors and not allowing them to come in on Sundays. They are discriminating because they claim that many of the boarders are objecting to the tourists because they are paid more attention to by the workers.

If you are to spend \$500,000 to subsidise the Tourist Board then we should expect to get back something out of it. When tourists come to the Island of Barbados, Barbados has not got any proper museum and you do not expect people to come to the Island just to watch "Ta-la-la-la" keeping a lot of noise or seeing a donkey cart pass by. We cannot afford to allow \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money to be spent in this way. I want to make it explicitly clear that I have nothing against the Tourist Industry. We must have dollars coming into the Island; but I am not going to sit here like some dumb driven cattle and let this thing go on to happen without my saying something on it.

When tourists come on Sundays, they go on a drive. They do not go to the country and suck cane. They may be going to the Crane or one of those hotels, and it is unfair for them to come here to help us when they are being discriminated against by some of these hotels. Is the Tourist Board expecting us to go on throwing away \$1/2 million like this? Why should we spend \$1/2 million to get people to come here to spend money and then when these people come here the managers of the hotels shut the doors in their faces? That is not idle talk. This is hurting the economy of this Island. If we go on spending money in this fashion, in ten years' time, it would be \$5 million.

For quite some time the taxi drivers of this Island have been discriminated against. There are only two places where you can land when you come to Barbados unless you come in from the air as Colonel Glenn the astronaut did, 6.20 p.m.

They either land at Seawell Airport or at the Deep Water Harbour. When they go to Seawell, they used to meet a monopoly by way of Dear's Garage and today when they go down to the Deep Water Harbour they meet a monopoly which was commensurate with Dear's Garage, and that was Parravicino. However, the taxi drivers must pay their licences and they must pay their Third Party insurance. In my opinion, it was a shameful state of affairs and it was harming the Tourist Board more than anything else. If you were there to see how the taxi drivers had to fight - as a matter of fact sometimes they had to compete with each other where rates are concerned; one fellow would charge \$12 for doing a job and another would charge \$10 for doing the same job. I am quite aware of the fact that the Hon. Minister has tried in his way to ameliorate the position. Nevertheless, I want to make it quite clear that the situation is far from being satisfactory where this matter is concerned.

I was a taxi driver myself and I do not want to say that we were sent here from Heaven as the Messiah for the purpose of relieving everybody of his burden; but this thing has been going on for too long. I am sorry that I cannot refer to the last Minister - I am sorry that I cannot say the late Minister.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: The "warri" player?

Mr. SMITH: Who is the "warri" player?

Mr. BOXILL: I am speaking about the Ex-Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. He went into power on the instigation almost entirely of the taxi-drivers. This is not licking at the dead horse; these are pertinent facts. The members of the last Government never saw fit to alleviate the situation. I am not saying that the Barbados Taxi Owners' Association could do all of the work and that Mr. Parravicino should not get any of the work; but there is no justification for his having any monopoly in an island like this. The taxi owners have to pay the same licence fees as anybody else. I am saying that it is a matter of mismanagement, bribery and probably graft. I am sure that the taxi drivers can at least breathe a sigh of relief since this Government has come into power, because I have seen where the new Minister of Communications, Works and Tourism has done quite a lot, which was within his power, to ameliorate the position which has been existing for the last ten or 15 years. If we are asked to subsidise an industry, so as to help the economy of this Island, to the tune of \$500,000, I am expecting that the whole community will see something tangible for our spending that amount of money.

I therefore will use my closing remarks in suggesting to the Chamber of Commerce that they ask the merchants of Bridgetown to see that when a tourist ship comes in, the hotels employ other waiters because it means that the regular waiters have to do a double amount of work for the same pay; then it also means that the majority of this \$500,000 goes to a small minority. I am therefore hoping that in the not too distant future somebody will try to alleviate the suffering of the poor hotel workers as well as the Clerks in Bridgetown.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. member who has just sat down and I think that this \$500,000 for the development of the Tourist Industry is necessary. By the tourists coming into Barbados, that profits this colony and we should do everything to encourage the tourist industry. When we come to speak about the taxi drivers, I hope that the time will come when the whole trade will be divided on a 50-50 basis; that is to say, the small taxi-drivers will have one-half of the work and the big taxi-owners will have the other half of the work. If a poor man has 50 cars he should have one half of the work, and if the big man has 50 cars he should have the other half of the work. I do not think that the big man should be grabbing all of the work for himself and the small taxi drivers have to watch that big man making his thousands of Canadian dollars while they may be getting only about 15% or 20% of the proceeds of the tourist industry. I want to say that the spoil should be divided between the big man and the small man so that the small man can help his family. I hope that the Government will, as a result of its policy, encourage more tourists to come into this colony.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON and Mr. SEALY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Michael caught my eye first. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications if he knows that there is a lot of dissatisfaction going on between the taxi-owners and the hotel proprietors. These tourists spend a lot of money in arriving in this Island and the poor taxi owner is at a loss to know where to take these people.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there is not enough accommodation in the Island for tourists when they come here, and we were wondering if you could not make it a little wider. I understand that if they go to Sam Lord's Castle that is closed, and the only place they can get in are at Coral Reef and Sandy Lane; but when they get there, they are told that the tourists come to worry the people who are already living at these hotels. I was wondering if there are no other hotels around Bathsheba and even as far as Speightstown.

Getting back to the taxi drivers, I can remember the days when a taxi driver would park his taxi on the Pier Head for five consecutive days before a boat arrived in the Island, and he refused to take even a funeral order so that he could stay on the Pier Head. All this was from the time of M. E. Cox. These men refused to move theirs so that they could get a job when the ship arrived in the morning; but when the ship arrived you would see Mr. Dear and Mr. Parravicino come down with their fleet behind them and these poor men would remain there without a job. I am praying for the time when a King will rise up who will take care of his children. I am told that it is not as bad as it used to be, but I am sure it can be a little better, because these men have to support themselves and keep their cars, and we feel they should live the same way as anybody else. \$1 1/2 million is a lot of money to be spent only for the use of Sam Lord's Castle and Coral Reef Club, and we feel that can be extended to go as far as Bathsheba.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be better for the Minister to reply after I have spoken, because if he speaks now he may have to reply again. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if it is one of the functions of the Tourist Board, but it has been drawn to my attention that all the business is sent to the West Coast to hotels like Sandy Lane and the others, and none is sent to the East Coast such as Bathshe-

ba. I do not know if the control is under the supervision of the Tourist Board, but I am appealing to the Minister, if it is like that, to look into it as there are hotels at Bathsheba which are willing and ready to entertain these tourists at any time, because I just heard from the hon. member that sometimes these tourists are shut out from certain hotels. I am sure that the hotels at Bathsheba are only too willing to receive all that come there, and I would be glad if the Minister will pass on that suggestion to the Tourist Board and ask them to see about it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the amount of \$500,000 for the Tourist Board is a very small amount if tourism must be developed in Barbados to any high standard as it has been developed in Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica and other tourist resort countries. The cost of advertising in the United States of America, Canada and Great Britain is rather expensive, and it would take more than \$500,000 to put Barbados on the map. This year the Tourist Board asked for \$3/4 million, and I am extremely sorry that the Government is not in a position to grant them the \$750,000, as Barbados is hardly known on the map in the outside world. It is known just around Montreal and one or two other places on the Eastern Seaboard of Canada, but it is hardly known in the United States of America. Most of the tourists that visit Barbados during the tourist season are Canadians; there are very few Americans. The Bahamas and Jamaica monopolise the majority of the United States trade.

Mr. Chairman, in Barbados tourists are being excluded from some of these hotels; they are usually cruise ship tourists that come into Barbados, and that is why we require more money in the Island for developing beaches and bathing resorts for bathing. Last year certain hotels had to rope off their quarters which was a very unkind thing for Barbados; yet we have to bear in mind that it is the duty of Barbados to provide accommodation for these people. It is not that the large hotels do not require these tourists but the people who come in on cruise ships monopolise the whole space, and if they are unable to accommodate their regular dwelling tourists, it would create a bad atmosphere. It is the responsibility of Barbados to provide accommodation for these tourists coming to the Island on cruise ships, and that is what we have under consideration now.

With regard to the taxis, that is a business I have been watching for many years, mainly those around the Pier Head when the old Baggage Warehouse was used. Days before a tourist ship arrived in Barbados, taxis would be parked along the seawall by the Pier Head and by the evergreen tree in order to secure passenger fares from the tourist trade. Most of the tourists, I gather, book cruise passages nowadays, including transportation fares, through the Travel Agents in Canada and in the United States of America, and they come along with their tickets already paid for Dear's Garage and Parravicino. That has been the trouble. I have found through investigation from the Taxi Owners Association and the single taxi owners that these people contract tours.
6.40 p.m.

I was able to make an agreement with Mr. Parravicino to give the other taxi agents their share. Since that agreement has been effected about five weeks ago, a very large number of outside taxis joined the Association which makes that percentage quite a low number now. In view of the number added to the Association we are about to review the percentage.

I have also had the same experience at the Airport at Seawall where Mr. Dear monopolised the trade there, and I also made an arrangement with him which was quite satisfactory; but since then the taxi owners, who naturally have the same right, have been joining in and that has also proved to be a small percentage since these have joined in that trade. I will also in a short time be able to negotiate for greater percentage for the taxis in that trade.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas mentioned something about the taxi owners when he said that \$500,000 was too much to be spent on the Tourist Industry when

everybody does not derive something out of it. Every bottle of liquor which is drunk by the tourist is worth Barbados ten cents through the duty received on it. This money voted to the Tourist Board is not spent in Barbados alone. A lot of this money is spent for the upkeep of bureaux in Canada, the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. and the majority of it is spent in advertising and putting Barbados on the map for the benefit of the industry. This is more so, as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said, owing to the fact that 37,000 tons of sugar would have to be sold on the World Market. That is why Barbados would have to pay greater attention to the Tourist Industry. It is only by that way we would be able to offset for the money lost on sugar due to our having to sell some at World Market price. We are spending this money so as to bring the Tourist Industry to the level of what obtains in the Bahamas.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it appears to be some misconception as to the manner in which the Tourist Board operates. As the Hon. Minister pointed out, the extension of the Tourist Industry is in the hands of the Tourist Board, and apart from the administrative expenses of the Board, almost the amount of the vote is spent on promotion of the industry outside of Barbados.

The revenue from tourism has risen from \$10 million a few years ago to over \$16 million last year, which means that the value of the Tourist Industry in Barbados is now half of that of the Sugar Industry. The revenue from sugar is about \$33 million and tourism now gives us nearly half that which sugar does. This year I would not be at all surprised if the Tourist Industry comes to \$20 million and by this and 1970, if not before, its value in Barbados would be just as much, if not more, as that of sugar; so that the hon. junior member for St. Michael is quite correct in deploring the circumstances that we cannot yet afford to devote more money to the Tourist Board for promotion of the Island abroad.

That is not to say that we are not going to tighten up on the administration of the Board itself. There are some avenues with which we are not in full agreement, and as soon as we get around to it, we intend to tighten them up and devote some of the funds which are spent in the direction to more profitable channels. But by and large, the future of the Island to a greater extent depends upon the development of the Tourist Industry and hon. members can rest assured that the money given to the Tourist Board is not thrown away.

Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Michael said that there are more Canadians here than Americans. Tourists from Canada are a fairly recent development in our tourist trade. Most of the tourists before came from North America and the change in tune is due to the fact that there are cheaper aeroplane rates from Canada than from the U.S.A. We are working on this because if we get a commensurate reduction in the rates from New York, the quicker we would get a rapid expansion of those tourists coming from New York.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter talked of a Development Council to carry on the development programme of the Island and to promote economic expansion. It may interest him to know that only about three weeks ago, the Government set up a Central Planning Committee, specifically for this purpose. There are four Ministers on this Committee with two Permanent Secretaries, some private Department Heads and the economists from the Planning Unit - Mr. Bonnett and Dr. von Gersdorff - and the Town and Country Planning Officer, and what this Central Planning Committee is doing is to enquire into all spheres of industry, agriculture, fisheries, and so on, with a view to presenting a guaranteed development programme at the earliest possible time in an attempt to promote more productivity so as to expand the national income.

In order to achieve this as fast as we can, the Central Planning Committee is now meeting every week on Friday mornings, and by the time that we develop the Budget and the development programme is presented to this House in another two or three months, the work of this Central Plan-

ning Committee would be in evidence and I am sure that even the hon. senior member for St. Peter would be satisfied that we have not wasted any time in getting down to this important business in preparing a well guaranteed plan for the development of this Island and for increasing the national revenue at the fastest possible level.
6.50 p.m.

I do not think that anything more need be said at this stage with regard to matters which have been raised under this Head.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the Hon. Minister for what he has said, more especially giving us information about the Tourist Board. I would not like it to be said that, because the increase in tourism has gone from \$16 million to \$20 million as compared with the \$36 million in the sugar industry, *vis-a-vis* the sugar industry this amount of \$20 million should mean more to the colony than the \$36 million. The tourist dollar it would appear should always mean more to a country because when you manufacture something you have to buy machinery and other things, and therefore the \$36 million which is earned by way of the sugar industry, would look like \$20 million. It must be considered however, that the majority of the food which the tourists eat is not grown in Barbados. When you look at the balance in trade you will find that there is a wide gap. You use imported food for the tourists, and when you take the value of the tourist trade with what the country spends in order to create the tourist trade, the net position of the country is not as heavy on that basis as you think it is. Nobody has made any correct evaluation as to the tourist industry.

When we come to the Economic Planning Unit, which you are setting up, you have Civil Servants appointed to that Unit. In this connection, I have an article here which appears in the New York Times of Thursday, 25th January, 1962. This is what is stated here:-

"The Trade Union Congress accepted with reservation today an invitation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Selwyn Lloyd, to join the National Economic Development Council he is forming.

The Council is intended to help the Government study economic trends and formulate long-term economic policy. Its broad objective would be to help attain progress while avoiding inflation.

On it will be representatives of the Government, management and labor. It will be assisted by a staff of professional economists.

The Trade Union Congress is a federation of unions with a total of more than 8,000,000 members. Its participation in the council was considered essential by the Government, but the Congress has been hesitating for months.

By a vote of 21 to 8, the General Council of the union group decided today to join....."

That is the trend which is taking place all over the world; here you have an internal planning unit but nobody from outside is giving any help.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was not here when the explanation was given, but I have been assured by my colleagues that the explanation given to the hon. member was to the effect that the Government has set up a Central Planning Committee comprised of myself, the Hon. Minister of Trade; the Hon. Minister of Communications; the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and their Permanent Secretaries, the Director of Agriculture, the economist from the United Nations Dr. von Gersdorff, the Town and Country Planning Officer and his Deputy; the Executive Officer, the Manager of the Waterworks Department and Mr. Bonnett of the Planning Unit. The purpose of that Committee is to co-ordinate all the plans and keep every Department supplied from week to week as to what progress is made by the Government. This is being run as a business, not as outdoor relief to the middle-class at all.

Apart from the Cabinet and Executive level of members we also have a Research Council which need not have any Government officers at all. It may be necessary to co-opt the Trade Union. This is an entirely planning Committee and is not on the wide level of a national planning Council at all.

As the whole thing is constituted, there is no sort of elaborate minutes or statutory provisions for the operation of this Committee. We are meeting once a week and we will get together and see what progress is being made. If we summon people from outside of that meeting it would be rather awkward, and there are matters which are discussed at that meeting and which are of a confidential nature at certain stages; but later on it will become public and general knowledge. This is not a Planning Unit but a Central Planning Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to that. In a country like the United States you have that Committee. Where you are thinking of matters of a national nature, it does not matter if people know about them. You have national issues here and how are you going to get people from outside with capital to be utilised? How are you going to get these people with capital and how are you going to stimulate the feeling that you are doing something? The Government Planning Unit would be the basis of utilising what you have in the Government to utilise. I am thinking of a broader basis - I am thinking of the scheme which they carry on in Puerto Rico which was outside the Government because it meant bringing people on a broad basis. I can bring one instance of what I mean to the hon. member; you take the question of technical training vis-à-vis your Development Plan. There is nobody other than people who are employed, who are going to be able to tell you what type of people you want in industry. You cannot get them in any Government Department. No Minister can tell me what are the trends in commercial sectors for the people you want. You need people from outside. I am only asking you to know what is happening or what has happened in the world on a broader basis and get these people where necessary. You must have an entirely uniform way; you must need a Cabinet.
7.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You know, Sir, that I am always going to take a different stand on this. This \$500,000 I do not think is too much. I want the Minister to listen because he has to answer me a lot of things. There are people who are trained in advertising and organising. We are going to spend \$500,000 for the Tourist Board under Item 49, and all the note says is "Grant to Tourist Board". I can well remember when my Party used to advocate doing something for tourism, and we suggested \$10,000 in those days when Governor Savage was here. We used to hear all sorts of things about us Conservatives wanting to put money into the pockets of rich people and so on; but I have lived and am still in here to see a different view being taken of it.

Mr. Chairman, \$500,000 is a lot of money. I am not saying it is too much money if Barbados is properly advertised. I have left this country and have had the opportunity of talking with some of the leading businessmen in the world, and I refer to the President of Pan American, Mr. Tripp; and when you have brains enough to organise a Company like Pan American, you belong to the top boys. I believe the Minister has said something already about how this \$500,000 is being spent. It is not good enough to give them \$500,000 - which I do not consider to be too much - if it is being spent in the proper way to advertise Barbados, because I think we have to regard the tourist industry as a second industry and one which you must depend upon apart from sugar cane. I hope the Minister concerned will listen to me. I would like to know where this office is in New York. First of all I mentioned - and the Minister has to answer this - that a gentleman here is drawing \$700 a month to advertise Barbados. I have never drawn \$700 a month since I was born; that is a lot of money. The only job I was offered in Barbados was that of a Sanitary Inspector, and I made Mr. Wilkinson understand that I intended to run the Board. \$700 a month is a lot of money, and I want to know what kind of professional man you have drawing this; and I am not talking about the Manager of

the Board. I am not criticising the Manager. I think you have selected a man of a most affable disposition in Mr. Paul Foster.

Mr. Chairman, you do not have to have a lot of sense when you are dealing with American people as tourists. American people do not like people with a lot of sense; they like people with a lot of popularity and know-how. You have to be affable and know when to go to cocktail parties and so on. I am sorry my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who is really my tourism expert and the man who can advise me, is not here, because I am going to ask why they are paying this man \$700 a month as a member of the Board to advise them. He is not the Manager or the man who is telling them what they ought to do in America or in Canada to advertise Barbados; and I understand there are choked-up offices in Third Avenue. Let the people on the Tourist Board give you the information, because I am not sitting down.

I understand, Sir, that Mr. George Hunte is getting \$700 a month. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is true.) Well, tell us what he is getting it for. If the Bridgetown City Council was giving a subsidy to the Salvation Army, you would ask for an audited statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I will just give the hon. member some information. This was absolutely nothing to do with us. The contract for the gentleman concerned who was also the Editor and promoter of "The Bajan" magazine - and they buy 7,200 magazines each year from the Tourist Board - appears to have been rushed through with almost indecent haste shortly before the elections. It is a three-year contract to pay a salary of \$700 a month to this gentleman as a Public Relations Officer. Now I want to make a statement on this right away; it is a three-year contract, a legally binding contract. I have been through the accounts and I want to make it clear that I do not think it is any part of my duty to conceal what is going on in this Department. I think that in future I am going to insist that the Tourist Board throw all their meetings open to the public, and a lot of other Boards as well - including the Transport Board and every other Board who is spending Government money. I do not see why they should conduct the business of the public in a conspiratorial manner, and I want to make it clear what my policy is.

Mr. Chairman, these people put in a request for \$3/4 million. I refused it because I discovered that they signed a contract with a person who has been a member of the Tourist Board to act as their Publicity Officer for \$700 a month and that the people were appointed to the Tourist Board because they were supposed to know something about publicity. In addition to that, if hon. members will let me finish, the promotional campaign in the United States was to the order of \$2,400 and the office is somewhere on the thirteenth or fifteenth floor in Third Avenue off the beaten track. I would say that the advertising work done by the Barbados Tourist Board which we did not appoint is dreary, unenterprising and dismal, to say the least.

If any member of the public picked up any of the popular travellers' magazines like "Holiday" or any of the popular magazines like "Look", "Life" or "The New Yorker", he would be able to compare the advertising that is done by the Jamaican Tourist Board, by the Bermuda Tourist Board and by the Puerto Rico Tourist Board and then compare Barbados alongside of them, and the comparisons are odious, to say the least.
7.10 p.m.

Now, I want to make it absolutely clear that the Manager of the Tourist Board is getting the same salary as a Permanent Secretary, that is \$9,480 per annum. We did not fix that; it was fixed by the Tourist Board and by the previous Government.

I will give you some of the figures: - The General Staff last year drew \$26,800; Administration expenses, \$34,390; Promotion expenses, \$15,000; Literature, \$85,000; Advertising in the United Kingdom last year, \$48,000; in Canada, \$88,944; in the U.S.A., \$105,436; Venezuela and Columbia,

\$17,000; the Caribbean Tourist Association, \$8,600; plus radio locally, \$6,000; General Advertising, \$65,000 and Visitors' expense, \$9,000, which is with entertainment, \$14,000 more than the Government Hospitality vote. Films, \$15,610.

This is the kind of thing which the Tourist Board has got along with. When we therefore ask certain members to cease being members, do not be surprised. We feel that the public of Barbados is being taken for a ride. We feel that any influx of tourists is predominantly due to cheaper fares by Trans-Canada Airlines and the advertising done by Pan American Airways Limited. I have made an analysis of the whole situation. The Hon. Minister of Trade went into office and we are absolutely horrified to know that there is no proper New York office despite all this money which we are spending. There is some advertising which has been done in a little room eight by eight for which they charge \$8,000 and in which they have a few folders. Some person went into this place on 3rd Avenue and said that he wanted to know some thing about Barbados and they told him to look somewhere in that room and he would see some folders.

I think that there would have to be drastic revision of the Tourist Board. That is how I feel about it because I am not satisfied that this \$500,000 is spent in the right way. That is the sort of thing which is going on. The Chairman of the Tourist Board is saying that somebody has to get his turn to go up to the U.S.A. He said that the Vice-Chairman cannot go because somebody must go up on turn. Although we have agents in Canada and the agents were down here about eight weeks ago, there is all this talk about this person going up by turn.

There is another thing which I want to say right now and I am not going to mince matters. I have examined the literature of the Barbados Tourist Board and have looked at the people whom they employ overseas. We have Barbadians living in Canada, New York and London. Leave London aside because they have now employed a single Barbadian in their office there. The members of the Barbados Tourist Board appear to be afraid to portray how people of African descent live in Barbados because in no part of their literature would you see how people of African descent live in Barbados. What you would see them portray of life in Barbados is somebody selling mauby, a horse cart drawn across the streets or a Harbour Policeman in uniform; but nowhere would you see that we have a House of Assembly in Barbados. What you see is some barefooted person with a jackass cart, if they condescend to put anybody at all.

This kind of thing is unsatisfactory too because when visitors come down here, they say to us that they are surprised at the sort of grace and hospitality and sense of humour of the Barbadian people themselves. I would tell hon. members that we know for certain that when Southerners come to Barbados, they do not want to be served by the same people who serve them in their country; they do not want to be segregated and put in a little cocoon. They say that they have come to the West Indies to escape from that kind of situation. I had to make a noise to get a West Indian employed on British West Indian Airways. The last Government would not raise a whimper about coloured people working on these airlines. Now that they have employed coloured air hostesses, they are the most acceptable and charming people to be found working on these airways. They want you to think that all we have is a few watertight compartments on beaches on which you will be carefully screened off from the natives of Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Premier for telling us what his policy is on the Tourist Board. We are diametrically opposed politically, but I want the Hon. Premier to get this straight as a pike staff. I do not at all agree with the method in the spending of this \$500,000. I believe myself that I have always found the present Manager of the Tourist Board a very affable man and, as I understand it, he gets the salary of a Permanent Secretary. I would not say that the salary which he gets and which is the same as that of a Permanent Secretary is too much for a man of his standing if he has to really travel and push Barbados. But what I am worried about, after paying him that

salary, find out from them whether they are satisfied. We are not satisfied with the way in which this \$500,000 is being spent. I have to pay income tax and I represent people who pay income tax.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the hon. member goes on, according to the Note which I see here the salary is \$7,200 and it was proposed to regrade the salary to that of a Permanent Secretary. It is not that he is drawing it now. In the Estimates which I saw, the salary was \$9,480. I have now been informed that it is \$7,200 which is to be regraded. I was reading from the file.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I might be wrong but that is his assistant.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are not wrong; that is as true as John 3, 16.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a very aggravating situation. This is no private business as long as you come to the House of Assembly for money. *Tout le monde back i lay* must know. Hon members must not get in their heads the idea because I am over here in this Party to which I belong that because it is Mr. George Hunte or Mr. Paul Foster that I am going to mince matters. I say that I do not agree with Mr. George Hunte getting any \$700 a month for what he is doing. I do not object to Mr. Paul Foster getting the salary which he gets. Write it down in the *Advocate* that the hon. senior member for the City said so. I cannot see what you are paying Mr. George Hunte \$700 to do.
7.20 p.m.

You cannot talk that nonsense; they refused to buy my book, but they could buy "Bim". I will say that we on this side were the first persons to advocate tourism; even the last Government was afraid of the idea of spending this \$500,000. I ask: why should these people not be given a proper office? I am glad to hear the Premier say what he has said. I have had the opportunity of discussing this matter with executives of Pan American; I told these high executives that Barbados would not be satisfied with coloured people only holding positions of porters in that Company. We want to see these people as clerks behind the counters too.

Coming back to the question of advertising of Barbados, you cannot split up this money like this. On the last occasion, the Government sacked all the members of the Board. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not here now because he is one of a company which has the biggest hotel industry in the island.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, this debate is getting confused. The figures last year in respect of the Tourist Board was \$500,000 which gave the manager a total emolument of \$10,080. This included house allowance and entertainment allowance, which is more than the salary of any Minister here. The figures I gave was what we were told. I read out \$9,480 but the actual figure was \$10,080.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you satisfied that George Hunte is getting \$700 a month?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, I am satisfied about that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will you do something about it then? I told you that a lot of crookedness would get exposed. Do you think that because it is George Hunte he will not get exposed?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain to the hon. senior member for the City that a contract was signed by the previous Government, just before the Election, with Mr. George Hunte. In the circumstances, we are not in a position to break that contract.

Mr. MOTTLEY: God have mercy on the people of Barbados! Do you mean to say that they signed a contract with

Mr. Geroge Hunte to do what? (A MEMBER: Public relations.) That is disgraceful. You must do something about that. Because we are representing capitalists, don't you think we will say something about this?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is a member of your Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He is not a member of our Party. I would like to hear the contract.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Chairman of the Board is also a member of your Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care who he is. I have my opinion and if I have to express my opinion I will express it. Who is the Chairman of the Board, Maurice Cave, Niblock or who? Whoever is Chairman of the Board they did wrong, and they could not do wrong without the connivance of the Government. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Thomas say that there is racial discrimination, not social discrimination. When the Sandy Lane property was being sold, I advocated that the whole of that stretch of land at Sandy Lane should be bought for the benefit of the people in Barbados. We have had an excursion from Bridgetown. We cannot get to the beach to have a bath because they put up something in the road and they have allowed people to buy up all the land. The ex-Minister of Communications told us that there is a 20-foot right of way reserved at Sandy Lane. I have a beach at St. James and I will say that I like to see women in bathing suits on the beach. However, the 20-foot right of way which the ex-Minister of Communications told us was at the beach at Sandy Lane cannot be found. I would like the Minister to make sure where this right of way is and tell us: "This is a public entrance".

Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter; this is \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money that we are talking about. People go to Paynes Bay and when they get there they cannot get anywhere to the beach. The ex-Minister of Communications, I repeat, says that there is a 20-foot right of way; therefore, let the Minister tell me where it is.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the comments of the hon. senior member for the City have been considered and we will pay attention to what he has said. At this stage, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

7.30 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended for 45 minutes, the House was in Committee of Supply on a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the Services of the Island.

It is within the competence of the House to appoint a temporary occupant of the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, while we are awaiting the arrival of the Chairman, perhaps we might discuss Shakespeare or Charles Dickens.

Mr. SPEAKER: At least I hope that the Debates for the remainder of this Session will be conducted in the language of Shakespeare or Dickens. (Laughter)

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is one regrettable feature, Sir, and it is that I am starting off without the Premier being in the House. (Mr. WALCOTT: He is not the Minister of Tourism). It does not matter; he is Premier. The Minister of Tourism, I am sure, will not be able to do what I am going to suggest. (Mr. SMITH: Do not talk to him, then.) I am talking my talk. I do not think we are at all satisfied with the idea of the salaries which have been brought to our notice and the statement made to us with authority and with documentary proof by the Premier as to the money paid out to the people on this Board. \$500,000 is a lot of money; but as I said, we over here do not feel it is too much money for the purpose of advertising tourism as our second industry, an industry which we have to depend on. As a mark of our disapproval and as a mark of protest that we do not agree that the Government should have entered into a contract, as I understood from the Premier, with Mr. Hunte for \$700 a month.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, he never said "the Government", he said "the Tourist Board".

Mr. MOTTLEY: He said that the Tourist Board agreed to pay Mr. George Hunte \$700 a month not as Manager but as Public Relations Officer and the Government ratified it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: They did too. What I mean is this: any salary to be paid by the Board of over \$4,000 a year has to be ratified by the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Therefore I am correct in saying that both the Premier and you as Minister of Trade are saying that this sum of \$700 a month which from my arithmetic is \$8,400 a year was ratified by the Government. I make no apology for the fact that I take strong objection to this, although we were the pioneers, so to speak, in pressing for the development of tourism and grants to assist the Board. As a mark of protest, even if I stand alone, I am going to make an amendment by deleting the amount. Sir, I did not say anything on the question of the deletion from the Estimates of the \$14,000 which provided refreshments for members of this House for many reasons, because members could very well not blame me for being selfish. I voted for the idea of taking this money out and the other member was the hon. senior member for St. Peter; but in my case members could very well say that because of my physical condition and because I cannot partake of the lunches and suppers which are offered, I voted for the deletion. I am not ashamed to say that for the past few years I have been living on a diet, but I am still living. I have never been able to partake of anything here except a Coke, and that is why I said nothing about it, lest anyone here should say that because the hon. senior member for the City cannot partake of what is provided, he was selfish enough to say it should come out. I am wondering whether it would not be infinitely better and if the general public would not be more satisfied if you retained the \$14,000 which you have cut out and which was spent not only for refreshments for members, but for your entire staff which must work right through as long as we sit. 8.25 p.m.

I would be prepared to face the public and say: how can anybody justify it? However, I would like to say here and now that it can only be for one year because this vote

comes up every year. I understand that this contract is for three years; but how can they make a contract for three years when the money is voted every year? To my way of thinking, I would not vote this \$7,200 at all. You are bound to upset the equilibrium in your entire Civil Service by doing this.

I am wondering if you cannot delete this £1,500. In any event if I do not succeed in getting you to delete it, I know that what we are in authority to do is to amend the vote to any amount down to a dollar as a mark of protest. I am sure that the Hon. Minister has expressed this view. Do not fool yourselves; I am publicly saying it that everyone of you Ministers has said that you disagree with it. Do not talk to me if you do not want me to say it. Everyone of you said that you do not agree with it; therefore, you cannot go behind my back and say that you agreed that Mr. George Hunte should get \$7,200. You could not honestly agree with it and say that you are a Socialist Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member must understand this. From now on, the Tourist Board would be operated under the policy of this Government. Furthermore, the Government is now considering shaping the composition of the Board. We cannot accept the reduction suggested by the hon. senior member for the City. The hon. member has to accept that the Government has just as much interest in this matter as he has. It is receiving our immediate attention and something will be done about it but we cannot accept any amendment for a reduction in the vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not understand the Hon. Minister. I have been in here not as long as he and I have seen it done. If you come in with a vote for \$500,000 and a man is getting \$5,000 of it, if we consider that the amount which he is getting is too much, we can express our disapproval in that way; we can reduce the vote by \$1 to show our disapproval. The Hon. Premier got up and expressed his disapproval of it and said that it was done by the last Government. Are you going to say if we reduce this by \$1.00 that you would not agree?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, earlier tonight it was pointed out by the Hon. Premier that the Tourist Board had budgeted for \$750,000. Now, we have refused to accept that budget and we have reduced it to \$500,000. That alone is significant of the fact that we are not in agreement with it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In other words, all the Hon. Minister has said to me is that the Tourist Board have asked for a lot of money and the Government realised the situation and told the Board that we cannot give that amount to you. I challenge the Hon. Minister to say that when they reduced it to \$500,000, they knew then what the Premier said here tonight. It is that they were paying a man \$700 a month for doing nothing and also paying him \$200 for magazines which he printed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Let me explain it. I agree with the hon. member. We are asking for \$1/2 million for the Tourist Board, but on the face of it, to say that we are carrying out the same programme and paying the same salary as that paid last year, that is not true. We are asking for the same amount of money but the money will not be spent in the same way as it was spent last year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have brought up this matter tonight and I am satisfied that it will not cause me to lose anything. What I say is this. If the present Government now know it is a fact what I have brought out — and they know that it is a fact — in other words, you are putting the Opposition in this peculiar position, a member can come in and talk as he likes, Mr. George Hunte would still get \$700 a month. I say that if an agreement was signed and you found that it was something immoral, then you should not carry it out.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is nothing immoral.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It might be nothing illegal. I feel that I am entitled to express this view. Some people receive money. It is a very easy thing to do; but on a question of

spending this money for Barbados, I remember when the now Minister of Education suggested that one of the best means for advertising Barbados on the opening of the Deep Water Harbour, was to spend some money and bring Princess Margaret down to open it, that members of the last Government said: "Oh no, the Prime Minister must do it". You would be getting \$500,000 advertising free because personality still prevails in this world and I am perfectly certain, as I have discussed it with certain people, if you had done that you would have had the National Network broadcasting and radio in the U.S.A. and parts of Canada. 8.35 p.m.

When I think of business, I am thinking of business. Barbados is a little place and we wanted it advertised and known in North America. There are many States in America where people live and they do not know that Barbados exists. The same thing is true about people in Canada. The sister of Her Majesty the Queen got married to a Commoner and if she came to the decision that she was coming here to open our Deep Water Harbour, you would find that nearly every station with television would send down here to find the Princess and her husband. That is where I supported the Minister of Education. It is not a question of national pride; sometimes you have to sink that pride for the good of the country. I have discussed this matter with several prominent persons in the advertising business; I want to say that when persons who are representing television in Barbados were asked to take pictures of the opening of the Deep Water Harbour they said "No"; but if the Princess had been opening the Deep Water Harbour the answer would have been "Yes". We are only four members in this Party and I think that, as a mark of protest, at least one dollar should be taken off this vote. You cannot have satisfaction in your Service in this way. Surely there are quite a lot of things which could be said on this matter and I reserve the right to say them.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is an important industry with which we are playing. Several statements were made and by innuendo the impression was given that the past Government did something by way of haste; that they rushed through a contract before the election. However, Sir, year after year without any question of an Election you will find that a grant was made to the Tourist Board. This is a question of history which most of us want to discuss. We are dealing with an industry which started at a figure under one million dollars and today it represents something like \$16 million; in fact, it is the second important industry in this country. We are now making sport with something which is vital to the economy of Barbados. This Board started as the Publicity Committee in a little building adjacent to the Baggage Warehouse. It was operating on funds of its own and then it asked the Government for a grant. When we were looking forward to the eight years' guarantee of the sale of sugar to the British Government we were also looking forward for something else; we requested that this Committee form an organisation and we started with something like \$200,000, as far as I can remember. In 1960-61 we gave this organization \$250,000; the figures are all here. This Organization grew from \$1 million to almost \$16 million which it represents in industry in 1961 and this is the third year in which we are making this contribution of \$500,000. We make a contribution and the hotel owners also make a contribution to the Board. When they reached the \$500,000 mark they asked us to match that contribution with another \$50,000 but now today we are making a lot of stupid talk in Parliament in respect of an industry which means something to the community.

The position is that we have a situation which we expected. We are giving the Board this half a million dollars and the yield to Barbados is something like \$15 million. All we requested them — and the terms of reference are there with the Minister. The affairs are those of the Board; we cannot tell them what publicity they should make and they are free to expand. We can say on the next occasion whether the amount should be out of the Estimates or not. The hon. senior member for the City was in agreement with the matter; he was in agreement with this amount of money; but when he was told that this man is to be given an increase, then it was a different matter. We do not want to injure the tourist industry which is making a valuable contribution to this island.

What is the purpose and function of this Board? It is not the function of the Government to change the magazine and that sort of thing. All the debate that has been going on is endeavouring to show that the hon. member is accusing Mr. George Hunte of being willing to allow the industry to suffer. The hon. member has some vendetta with George Hunte.
8.45 p.m.

Are you saying this because George Hunte is not the type that would cringe? It is not for the Government to decide what George Hunte should get for a salary; it is not for us to make the contract.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I object most strongly to the hon. member saying that I have some vendetta with George Hunte. Surely I have no vendetta to vent any spleen on George Hunte. Is the hon. member suggesting that if it were somebody of a different colour or complexion and this had been done, I would not have said what I did?

Mr. MILLER: Is that a point of order or the hon. member's third speech?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just object to your saying that I have some vendetta with George Hunte. It is not true. What I am to do with whether or not George Hunte cringes?

Mr. MILLER: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, it would not matter if you gave the Manager \$2,000. I have no axe to grind, but I am concerned with your toying with an important industry. Instead of getting \$16 million from the Tourist Industry, you hope in another three years to get probably \$32 million, and if he has been working and taking care of the publicity on this Board for the last five or seven years and the dividends are satisfactory to the Government, what are we to do with how much he is getting? They are not asking for an increase in salary or employing another person. It is not a question of whether there are coloured girls working in the office in New York, Toronto or England; it is George Hunte. The Government is nothing to do with George Hunte, and if he is paid a salary in excess of \$4,000, they must consult the Cabinet. Do you think the Minister should attempt to tell the Chairman of the Board whom he should employ or dismiss, or what salary he should pay them? This is not the type of business you can run from a Ministry. If the Minister is not happy or satisfied, let him fire the Board and appoint another Board.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important industry, and a continual drift and deterioration of the debates in this House on an important industry is taking place to such an extent that I fear you are running this country into danger. From time to time in the paper you see criticisms of George Hunte, and the hon. senior member for the City asks what is that to do with the industry or Parliament or the Government. We are giving them \$1 1/2 million which yields \$16 million, but the hon. member thinks that the amount should be reduced by \$1 or one cent because he thinks it would be some form of embarrassment to George Hunte. One would imagine that the hon. member would congratulate the Premier on spending this \$1 1/2 million, because we have been seeing cuts here and there, and you run a bone over the hungry police dogs' mouths. We know how important this industry is, but the hon. member talks about George Hunte because it suits him.

Mr. Chairman, we must not toy with the life blood of this country and its growing population. It is all right to talk glibly of another 25 years when the population figures would probably be 400,000, but you know what is going to take place in the meantime. All the marginal lands will have to be brought in for housing and accommodation for schools and playing fields. Can this Island of 166 square miles feed and support a population of half a million people? When you answer that in your mind and know that it is going to take place in your life time, can we come here with all this shilly-shally talk because we want to get even with somebody? I am in the Opposition and I feel equally responsible, and honest to heavens that is how I honestly feel and sincerely feel when we are discussing a matter like this. There are a quarter of a million souls on the outside waiting to

see what we can do as a Government after all those promises, hollow and otherwise, which were made, but you come here with a main industry and because of some old spite and vendetta, you will reduce this Board to ridicule.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attitude and statesmanship of the Minister in attempting to justify it, but you cannot toy with the contract as it has nothing to do with the Government. They run their own affairs and they ask Government to make a contribution. Do you want to tell them whom to employ and how much they should pay him? That is the responsibility of an independent Board, and I wish to heaven that you would take a more serious view of your responsibility. I am answerable to no one else but the electorate of St. George, and when you hear me say that, you will understand that I am a free soul and have a mind and a soul of my own; but because you can use the shelter and protection of the House when you would not attempt it elsewhere, you are going to toy with \$15 million or \$16 million when you know we are bursting at the seams through lack of accommodation in the country and we really have to rely on an industry such as this. I therefore cannot support the reduction of one dollar as suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is a most shameless person.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you know I raised this matter and then I had to leave the Chamber because I had another meeting to attend. That is why I say I have to work here and then go out and work also.

Now the hon. junior member for St. George was very emotional in this matter, but I do not want to do what the hon. senior member for the City was doing. I am not going to support the idea of reducing the vote by \$1 because I think the Minister made the position quite clear. I know more about this than the Minister because I have to study economics in this Island; I live with them. I heard the Premier say that the \$16 million from the tourist trade is on paper, but the value of the tourist industry cannot be interpreted as \$16 million. My analysis of it is a little different. The Tourist Industry is a business which you encourage because it adds to your national income. The reason why the Barbados Tourist income has increased is not because you are spending \$500,000. If the Cuban Tourist Industry had been open to the North American people, you would not get so many North American people coming to Barbados; they would have gone from Miami to Cuba. The number of people who went to Havana annually from the United States of America was more than that of the people who went to all the other British West Indian Islands altogether. Havana is closed and therefore we were vying for the North American trade, because Havana was a name for tourists both in Canada and America.

In this House, there has been a great deal of feeling, and the hon. junior member for St. George knows that his Government was not always enamoured about tourism; so I do not think the hon. junior member for St. George should take umbrage at what the hon. senior member for the City raised. You do not stultify something or go against it if you are part of the operation. Let us be quite frank. It does not mean because you are getting \$16 million from this business that you can go and pay out any kind of money to anybody, because it would be just like a watchman who comes and tells you that he is watching a building with all those millions in it, and he feels he should get as much as the Manager, because when the Manager is sleeping, he is watching the building.
8.55 p.m.

What I think was stated was not that we do not value publicity but within the context of a man doing a job in Barbados — and you say that you give the man \$700 as Public Relations Officer and you know what the duties are, and so you query that. It was revealed that the Manager was getting \$10,000 a year. I do not make any fun about whether it is Mr. Paul Foster or Mr. George Hunte because I am a bit different from the hon. senior member for the City. He said that Mr. Paul Foster was a very affable fellow. Whenever a white boy is doing a job about here, these same peo-

ple who sit down here on the Tourist Board and are at top, such as Mr. Niblock and Mr. Maurice Cave, they have the idea that white boys like Mr. Paul Foster have the right to live well and get \$10,000 a year; but whenever people like myself sit down and we start to direct anything, you hear those same big white merchants talking a lot about the money which we are getting. We get in the House of Assembly \$200 a month and you hear all sorts of remarks by these people. That is a criticism which I have to make. There is a lot of people in Barbados who feel that people of a certain complexion should eat well and live well and people like us who happen to be of a low degree should remain low. We should have a big pram or wheelbarrow in our hands and no money should come to us. As soon as they find that you are getting \$1,000, somebody wants to turn over your house or shut you out. That is why I said earlier today that everybody is seeing who can work for \$1,000 a month first. You hear them talking about the salaries which Civil Servants are getting and the salaries of the people who work in the Public Service; but when they have one of their own to pay, they will give him \$1,000 a month without winking.

They say: do not worry about this \$500,000 which you are spending on the Tourist Board because the Tourist Industry is worth you \$16 million a year. The say: do not quibble over a man getting \$700 a month. If you go to the Sugar Industry, you will see that it is worth \$36 million but you are not going to pay the Manager of Vacluse any \$700 a month. If you were to do that, you would hear them saying: "Are you going to give him all the money in the place?" Let me hear what a man like me should be getting per month. Do you think the Manager of the Tourist Board has a bigger job than I have to do? I know that he does not have as big a job as I have to do. Do you think that my job is one walking about drinking cocktails? When it comes to these things, I say that some of us have to work hard, but people believe that some of us have the right to be poor and remain poor and then let the almshouse bury you.

The reason why all this debate has taken place about this matter is because of what has been revealed. I did not know that Mr. George Hunte was getting \$700 a month. I am not picking on Mr. George Hunte nor have I anything against him. However, I will not agree to any reduction of this vote by \$1.00 for this reason. Even my hon. friend on my immediate left, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, will agree that you have to teach young fellows how to govern. The money which the Tourist Board is getting from the Government is not the total income of the Tourist Board; therefore, if you reduce this vote by \$1.00 you are protesting against the action of the Government because the Government has decided that they are going to give the Tourist Board this sum of \$500,000. The Tourist Board is under obligation by contract to pay Mr. George Hunte \$700 a month, and if the Board does not pay him that amount per month he can take legal action to cause them to pay him that money.

I should also say that the Government cannot enter into any discussion to call upon the Tourist Board to break the contract between them and Mr. George Hunte. The most that the Government can say to the Tourist Board is that they see that the Board is in such a healthy position because they are getting \$500,000 subvention from the Government that they can afford to give a man as much as \$700 a month. Of course, if the Tourist Board did not have to come to the Government for money, it would not be the Government's business if the Board paid him \$700 or \$1.00 a month.

I do not think the hon. junior member for St. George should mind my saying this. He has been to New York and he knows that if you are down in 3rd Avenue that when you put your Tourist Board Office in any building on that street, you are making sport. West Indian organisations have a fetish in going off the beaten track. You will see West Indians when they must have an office in London, carry it all down Norfolk Street and you will have to ask somebody to show you where it is. Nobody can find where the office is. You walk around in a circle and you cannot find the place. 9.05 p.m.

Now they have gone with the Tourist Board in Third Avenue. Why are you going up in Third Avenue to look for a place like that to put the Tourist Board? If we make this kind of criticism we make it because when we leave this country we try to be ambassadors for our country. When we leave here, we leave here on that basis; when I leave here, I have some wealthy friends abroad and when they take me out they do not take me out to that kind of place. If you live with friends, they live well and you will get to know what good living is. You are aware that the Office of B.O.A.C is in Fifth Avenue and you go there; therefore you have to run a small place in a big place. If you want to go on Fifth Avenue or on 42nd Street, you want to go where life moves. What are you going into Third Avenue with the Tourist Board for? Are you going to buy old Army clothes, old boots or what? (Laughter). This criticism is not to hurt the Tourist Board or anybody who is coming here; we want to see the people in these offices demonstrate that we have coloured people coming here. Some of the people whom they ask to come in here are not people whom I should meet. When I go into one of these offices, people think that I am looking for a job.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think what the hon. senior member for the City said was an attack on the Board. When the amount of money was read out, the money out of which the manager was getting £1,500, I said that that could not be right. He would be obliged to be getting more than \$600 a month. The young man Smith is getting that salary. When I was a boy instead of jumping over a wall I jumped in a well; therefore, I have not got to be afraid of anybody. However, I do not like this idea that as soon as you put a little white boy or girl to do a job, the money goes up. I have nothing against Mr. Foster; he is a very affable person. I do not discuss people in the House of Assembly; I like to discuss principles; but when they sit on these Boards they can think of this kind of money to give some people; but when people look like me, if I get a post carrying a salary of \$400 a month then I am lucky.

All of these people quarrel about the money which a Permanent Secretary is getting; do not tell me that a Permanent Secretary is not deserving of his money when he is working as a top man to a Minister, but that a man who is working on the Tourist Board is not getting sufficient. Do not say that you will give this man, who is the same George Hunte, \$700 a month when you are talking about all of this money which we are paying out; I ask: if you can give \$700 a month to a Public Relations Officer for the Tourist Board, what should the Minister who is in charge of the Tourist Board get? Mr. Chairman, let me hear that. If this man who is not playing on the team but gets a little pick on the team is getting this money, what is the Minister getting? Whenever the Minister's robe is taken off what are you left with? The Minister is getting \$800 a month and a Public Relations Officer who is somebody in relation to a Permanent Secretary is getting \$700 a month! That does not appear to be right. On the constitutional basis, this Government could not say to the Tourist Board that they are not going to honour a contract which has been drawn up; your funds are not the only funds which the Tourist Board administers. The most that the Government could do would be to reconstitute the Board if it comes to a question of their having no confidence in the actions of the Board. The Government is in duty bound to carry out the contract; they cannot say that they have to break the contract with Mr. George Hunte, because that would savour of too much political interference with the Board in an action which you allowed the Board to take. If you have approved of the appointment of a Public Relations Officer at a salary of \$700 a month you have to be very careful about it; in fact, there is very little which you can do about it. I would persuade the hon. senior member for the City not to press for any reduction of the dollar under this Head because that would not be a reflection on the Board; it would be a reflection on the Government. 9.15 p.m.

We have spoken and said what we had to say about the Board, and that is what we should do. They are not voting too much money for the Board as such, and if you are satis-

fied that too much money is not voted for the Board in these circumstances, any reduction would be a reflection on the Government's decision to grant them the money, and that is not the decision we are taking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to prolong this debate, but I only rise before the Minister gets up to reply to the hon. junior member for St. George, the ex-Minister, to let him know that this harangue which he thought he started in here.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I am not aware that I started any harangue in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying that the harangue which he started in here by suggesting that I had some vendetta with George Hunte could only come from a person who is a type of political turn coat.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I take it that the hon. member is thinking that he is clever by becoming personal. I have no skeleton in my closet to hide. I have absolutely nothing in my life to be ashamed of, and if he wants to join me in a little personal combat, we will have some fun.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again I say that the type of harangue started by the hon. junior member for St. George by suggesting that I had some vendetta with George Hunte and that my speech would interfere with the \$16 million which the Tourist Industry brought in and for which his Government had done so much, could only come from a political turn coat.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is the type of vulgarity that one should take exception to, but I am not asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw. I treat him with the sort of contempt which he deserves, but if he repeats it, I may have to say something further. I repeat that I have no skeleton, ugly or otherwise, in any private closet of mine, and I have nothing of which to be ashamed. I have no axe to grind and I had no reason to feel anything for George Hunte when I spoke on this matter. I was only concerned with the \$16 million brought to this country, and I want to tell members of the House that only if the Board wanted to employ somebody in excess of \$4,000 a year, they would have to consult the Ministry, but the members of Parliament have nothing at all to do with the salaries. What would I have to turn coat about at any stage in my life?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member finished or does he want to go on some more? I am perfectly happy to let him go on a little longer. I still repeat what I have said for the benefit of the hon. member. If he would just examine his mind, he would see that my Party for years fought in this House with the Government, his Government, to give assistance to a Publicity Committee to do something for tourism, and we fought it as one of our planks on the platform. From the time the hon. junior member for St. George came here, we were fighting with his Government who were opposing everything in tourism. It is only after Governor Savage in his opening speech said that we had to look to another industry that his Government accepted it. When the hon. member gets up in here and says that I have some vendetta with George Hunte, that is what I object to and nothing else, because if I had something against George Hunte, I would come here and say so.

Mr. Chairman, you are granting half a million dollars to the Tourist Board, and some people seem to think that because you express a view here on this, you are doing the industry harm. Who did more harm to the industry than his Party? For ten years they kept this back until Governor Savage got in the Other Place and said in his speech from the Throne that we would have to look to this industry. Naturally when he said that, the position in Barbados was such that if we ever had a drought and a slump in the sugar industry, we would have to look to tourism, and it was only then that the Government came and said they would give dollar for dollar. The hon. member said it does not matter to me if the Manager gets \$1,000 a month. The Premier read out to me what I considered was factual. The Hon. Premier

does not know how I know things when I ask them in this House. There are a lot of questions I have to ask, but I am not going to ask you to re-commit something to say that something dishonest is going on.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member talks about skeletons, but there are skeletons and skeletons. I know what he means by closets because there are privies and closets; some smell stink too, you know. The bald facts are that you are granting \$500,000 for the publicity of Barbados, and it is being done by Pan American. We said that we will grant them \$1 1/2 million, but if they are going to pay salaries over \$4,000, we must ratify them. The hon. member said that I have a vendetta with George Hunte, but I see no reason in the world why I should. He cannot prevent me from getting in here. I said it does not matter what Paul Foster gets. His salary from the figures here is \$840 a month which the Premier said includes house allowance. Now I find no fault with that. I find no fault with that salary for a whole-time officer as Manager of the Tourist Board, who has to travel and leave his family, whether it be Paul Foster, John Foster, George Hunte or anybody else. Now that the Government has ratified the salary of \$700 a month for a part time job, in actual fact the Public Relations man is getting more than the Manager. One thing I have always had is the courage of my convictions, and nobody in Barbados can accuse me of being one of those treacherous people who come to the House of Assembly and do not want to say something, and then say it outside.

Mr. Chairman, even the hon. senior member for St. Peter seemed to have misread the point. If you are granting \$500,000 and for any salary over \$4,000 they must come to you, you therefore hold some control over its expenditure. You are paying a part-time man \$700 a month, and because it is brought out that we do not like it and that the offices they have are not good enough, the hon. member says I have a vendetta with George Hunte. I have not accused the present Government at all, Mr. Chairman; but what I say is this: I might be constitutionally wrong in asking that the amount be reduced, and it may also be a reflection on this Government; but I do say it is still to be shown to me that the Tourist Board can hire a man and pay him what they like, and then if they are going to pay over \$4,000 they must come to us. I would like to ask you gentlemen in this Chamber in the Government if we were paying a man over \$4,000 whether you would not ask us to tell you what we were paying that for.
9.25 p.m.

Are you paying him to run rats out of the hotels? What are you paying him for? You are paying Mr. Hunte over \$700 a month. What are you paying him for? What are you paying this part-time man for? What the hon. senior member for St. Peter said was right. You have an Accountant at \$600 a month; then you have a part-time man at \$700 a month. The hon. member took umbrage and he thinks that somebody has something against Mr. George Hunte. There is not one capitalist in Bridgetown who can shut my mouth. Let the hon. member be aware of that and be aware of it now and forever. I am only going to quote the Hon. Premier. If you are giving a subsidy to any organisation and you find that the organisation can afford to pay out what they consider, and what any reasonable person would consider, excessive salaries, is it not time to say that we cannot give you all of this?

I say and I repeat that I am not questioning the salary of the Manager. If he has to do a job leaving his home and going abroad and it is at a salary of \$840 a month, that is not too much. This is not a job where you question the ability on the part of the person holding it because it does not take the ability of a Permanent Secretary to be Manager of the Tourist Board. One of the qualities of the person holding this job is that he must be an affable person who can sell Barbados and that is why I do not make the comparison with that of the intellectual ability of a man who is secretary to the Ministry. But what I say is this. Surely, if you give the Manager \$840 a month, then it is wrong to ratify a man in a part time job at \$700 a month, a man who has an office and is running another business altogether, to such an extent that the Hon. Premier can tell us besides

doing that, you are buying \$1,500 in books from him. I know more about this matter than the Hon. Premier and the Ministers over there. When I tell you what Mr. George Hunte draws, may be the Income Tax Commissioner will ask me to come in and see him.

Let me say that my Party was the first Party to advocate tourism. The Barbados Labour Party said then that all we wanted to do was to put money in the hands of the Goddards. If they had done what we told them at that time, you would not have been in the position today of having to build the Blue Waters Hotel.

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. If we seek to amend this vote by \$1.00, it would look as a reflection on this Government because the Tourist Board actually asked for \$750,000 and the Government reduced it to \$500,000. But I am counselling the Hon. Minister to see this. Surely, if you are giving a subsidy to the Tourist Board and they are paying a salary which would upset the equilibrium of your Service, you should say something to them. The men in your Service are bound to say, "Here it is. I am coming into this office from 8.00 o'clock to 4.00 o'clock - and possibly carrying home work - and getting a salary of \$4,000 per annum and the Tourist Board is paying \$700 to a man for part time work and the Government is sitting down and doing nothing about it." That man is going to his office and doing other things and you sit down and ratify that man's salary for part time work at \$700 per month. Are you going to tell me that you have no say in the fixing of his salary? The fact is that under the terms and conditions of the agreement you have a right to say that if I give you this subvention at all, you must tell us what you are doing with it. If, however, we discover that you can pay out a lot of money in salaries, then we will say that we are not giving you all this money. Let me ask this: did the last Government know that this was a part-time job? It was felt that some people can draw \$700 a month for a part-time job when they know that you are drawing \$700 from another place and \$300 from another place!

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the reduction of this vote by \$1.00 would appear as a reflection on the Government in view of the fact that the Government reduced what the Tourist Board put up to \$500,000, but it would not be a question of a reflection on tourism and bringing people to this Island. We have expressed our view and if this Government has a right to say that over \$4,000 they must ratify it, surely you are not going to be rubber stamps.

The hon. junior member for St. George has the idea that his defence of the Government is to accuse people of something which he knows is not true. He thinks that I have a vendetta with Mr. George Hunte.
9.35 p.m.

I am not ashamed of saying that. I go to sleep with it and I know it. It could have been George Hunte or anybody else. I say that this salary of \$700 a month for a part-time job is too much money. If you support this action I will keep a one-man meeting and say that you are not acting in the interest of the colony.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the record I want to say a final word. The hon. member spoke of the last Government which sponsored this thing. I want to tell the hon. member that we were not ashamed about this; we have to be very cautious about this matter. We have had the opportunity of studying the effect of tourism on Jamaica; if you are in love with your country you have to be very careful. Not even the best could persuade us not to go on with the tourist industry which we can hold under our control. I happened to be at Montego Bay with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You have an egg costing a shilling and the parent of a child could not even give it an egg. You have the instance of the last Speaker and Dr. Springer having been embarrassed when they were refused entrance to a hotel. We want to be very careful in these matters. (ASIDES) What is the hurry with the hon. member? We can be here until Sunday discussing this matter; and I may say that if it is a question of filibustering, we are not filibuster-

ing like the last Opposition. I am saying that we want to be careful as to what we are doing in this country; we want to be very careful where the question of tourism is concerned. Tourism is not the type of industry on which you can solely rely. It is periodical and we want to do the right thing. We want to be careful and we want to attract finance to this country. There was no intention to be critical of the Government; what I am saying is that we have to be very careful with the financial position of the country.

The question that the sum of \$924,690 under Head 47 - Subsidies and Grants - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1. ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

1. Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$425,248 under 1. Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to deal with the Auxiliary Postmen and that is Item 16 of these Annexed Estimates - Post Office. In view of the fact that some of these Auxiliary Postmen have been serving for a matter of 15 years, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Communications that some of them have to leave their homes at 6.45 o'clock in the morning in order to clear the post boxes in St. John. I would like to find out if permanent jobs cannot be provided for these postmen.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. junior member for St. John for bringing this matter to my attention. I will promise the hon. member to have an investigation of the matter.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for his promise.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Hon. Minister if it would be possible for some of this overtime pay in respect of Item 11 to be devoted to the employment of young people who have just left school. These people would assist in the Department and they would have this overtime work rather than that we should swell the salaries of the members of the permanent staff. Some of these young people have left school for about five years and they have not yet done any work for five minutes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: With reference to what the hon. junior member for the City has said, I should like to inform him that it is only on certain occasions, at Christmas time for instance, that the Post Office is overloaded with mail. At that time of the year the Post Office has to acquire the services of extra assistance and then these extra people are engaged.

The question that the sum of \$425,248 under 1. Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that we had postponed the consideration of Head 36, Ministry of Education, early in the day. I am now asking leave to revert to that Head.

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

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In connection with this Head, I am asking leave to make the following amendments. In connection with Item 36 "Expenses of motion picture production" the amount there is to be reduced by \$5,622 and

this will make the revised provision \$5,000. In connection with Item 38 "Teacher Training" the amount there is to be increased by \$22,200, making a revised provision of \$64,500

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$324,407 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Minister of Education whether, in the increase for Teacher Training, any provision is made for the training of teachers in the independent schools. The Hon. Minister must be well aware that there are over 10,000 children who attend schools of that type as against 4,000 in the Government-maintained schools.

9.45 p.m.

We are wondering whether provision has been made for the training of a percentage of the teachers who have to bear the bulk of the teaching in these schools which must eventuate in a general raising of standards in the teaching at these schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must be very honest with the hon. member. None of this is for the training of teachers in private secondary schools. This increase is due to the fact that the Ministry of Education has succeeded in persuading the Cabinet that it should be responsible for more of its own training, and consequently funds have been shifted from the Training Scheme Fund to the control of the Minister, so to speak.

Secondly, I would like to say that the scheme for assisting in the training of the teachers in private secondary schools will go forward independently from this, and is receiving my attention.

Mr. LYNCH: I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for his reply, but what I am exercised in mind about is whether teachers, as obtained in the past, from Tortola, the Virgin Islands and various inlets about the Caribbean area, will continue to be trained at Erdiston, while teachers from independent schools in this colony, who are doing work which the Government of this colony cannot do, are denied such training.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the hon. member knows the answer to that question as well as I do. I have recently received a delegation of Heads of independent secondary schools, and I gave them my assurance that as from next September my Ministry would undertake to provide certain types of training for their staffs. That offer still holds good.

The question that the sum of \$324,407 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (2) ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (2) Erdiston College - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$32,494 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (2) Erdiston College - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (3) TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (3) Technical Institute - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$52,443 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (3) Technical Institute - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, we would appreciate a certain amount of deceleration on this side of the Table. It is true it is late, but Education is a very important subject and we are marshalling our forces.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (4) HOUSECRAFT CENTRE

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (4) Housecraft Centre - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$12,444 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (4) Housecraft Centre - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (5) SCHOOLS

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (5) Schools - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2,244,277 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (5) Schools - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, under Item 3 - Supernumerary Teachers - I would like to ask the Minister if it is the Government's intention to relax or to have a policy where these supernumerary or what is known as Relief Teachers are paid on a better basis. Some time ago in this House we criticised the method of paying these teachers on a day to day basis. I understand that some of these supernumeraries work frequently, that is to say, they are on the staff for two or three years on that basis, but during the vacation they are not paid. I think the Minister should initiate a policy in which persons who are supernumeraries and are engaged for periods which include vacation should not lose their emoluments.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter to say this: with regard to the relief teachers, all the points he has raised are under active consideration, and I am hoping to be able to announce a new policy shortly in respect to them.

With respect to the supernumeraries, I must say that supernumerary teachers are teachers who are in most respects like teachers on the Establishment except for the fact that they are not appointed. My Ministry is following the suggestion laid down in the Jacobs Report that all supernumerary teachers who are obviously qualified should be appointed, and steps will be taken in the course of the coming year to do that. Such of them as are qualified will be put on the Establishment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one thing about those teachers who are not on the Establishment and whose salaries have been kept back for two weeks and a week. Would the Minister look into that? It creates a hardship on those teachers who are not on the staff.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I will give that assurance.

The question that the sum of \$2,244,277 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (5) Schools - stand part

of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (6) INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (6) Industrial Schools - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$46,971 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (6) Industrial Schools - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - (7) PUBLIC LIBRARY

Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (7) Public Library - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$51,457 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (7) Public Library - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether at this stage it would be possible for provision to be made for the microfilming of various documents to be done by officers at the Public Library as is done in the Island of St. Thomas in the United States Virgin Islands where a person can go and get a baptism certificate done at very low cost and other documents of that nature, instead of standing in line for hours and days on end in other Government Departments. In the United States Virgin Islands that type of work is done at the Public Library very efficaciously and with great despatch. I am wondering if some consideration could be given to its being done at the Public Library here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I must thank the hon. member. The answer is that consideration could also be given to that. The hon. member will remember that earlier today he asked a similar question of the Hon. Premier and an assurance was given that the matter will be looked into. I would just like to add that personally I think this whole question should be tied up with the whole problem of preserving and keeping the archives of this Island, whether of Institutions or of the Government itself; but certainly for the preservation of documents of historical merit, microfilming is the answer.

The question that the sum of \$51,457 under Head 36 - Ministry of Education - (7) Public Library - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one or two questions under Head 26 - Housing on page 65, and I would like to ask that this Head be recommitted. 9.55 p.m.

I am sure the House would be anxious to grant me leave to say one or two things on it.

I am therefore asking leave that Head 26 - Housing - be recommitted.

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

Head 26 - Housing - was recalled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate that the Hon. Minister of Housing has just taken office but I do not think all is well in this Department and I would like to get a little information from him as to what is happening there. I would like to find out on what basis officers obtain loans for buying motor cars and if it is true that actually the Chairman was given a loan contrary to regulations for the purchasing of a car and was also paid travelling allowance. I would like to know whether that has been drawn to the attention of his Ministry. I do not want the opportunity to pass without making that enquiry here. I want the Hon. Minister to find out what is the position.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I would like to assure the hon. senior member for the City that I appreciate very much the information from him and I will go into it and have an enquiry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister very much but I did not ask that you should have an enquiry into it.

I will repeat what I have said. I have enquired from you if it is within your knowledge that loans are made at the Housing Authority for the purchasing of motor cars and if it is a fact that a loan has been made to the Chairman of that Board or whether it is within the knowledge of that Board or the Minister of the Department. I would be very unfair to comment on it unless you are able to give me some information on it. I have already promised that I will not waste any time on it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Sir, before we pass on from this Head, I would like the responsible Minister to tell me, if he knows, what has been the system of that Department in collecting rents and if he is aware that many persons who are supposed to pay their rents monthly have allowed their rents to lapse for months and years and then suddenly the Department calls on those persons for a large amount of money which is due for rents. Surely, one could say that if a man rents a house, or has to pay rent weekly or monthly that it is his business to go and pay that rent weekly or monthly, as the case may be; but I understand that this Department has certain rent collectors and I would like the Hon. Minister to make enquiries about those persons who are to go around and collect these rents and see whether they are doing their duty or whether they are allowing those persons to lie in false security and then be suddenly called upon to pay abnormal amounts of rent.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The Housing Board has special members for collecting rents but I have never been aware that they pick special opportunities only to go to people when their rents have been long overdue and too high for them to pay. However, I will have an investigation made into that also.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I can assure the Hon. Minister that only last week more than four persons approached me with a letter owing more than \$200 rent and it was never asked of them. I want to know the policy of the Housing Department. The Hon. Minister may not be aware that everything is not working as it should be with the entire staff from the top down to the messenger. If the Chief Clerk or top official fail to give the Messengers orders, how can he expect them to be carried out? 10.05 p.m.

The question that the sum of \$45,561 under Head 26 - Housing stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD 24 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LANDS AND FISHERIES

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave that Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries - be re-committed.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the reason why I am asking for the recommitment of this Head is that I would like to enquire of the Hon. Minister as to the policy of making loans from the Bank. I would like to know if he can tell us whether any money has been loaned this year or within the past year to persons without their adhering to the law in relation to advertising the names, and whether any of these people are direct employees of the Bank or other parts of the Service who are not holders of land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked whether the policy as to advertising loans has been changed. I should like to inform him that that policy remains static; the policy should normally be adhered to. The second point was whether Government employees are entitled to loans or whether loans have been granted to such employees and whether the formalities have been adhered to. The Agricultural Bank as at present constituted, is a Statutory Body and functions on its own as any normal statutory board functions under the control of the Ministry of Agriculture. As to the present constitution of the Board, members are appointed for three years and their tenure of office is still in existence. Their services have not yet been terminated.

As regards the system of advancing loans, the Board holds their meetings and various applications are considered and advances and loans are decided upon with the approval of the Minister. The Minister does not approve of loans before the loans are actually advanced, but the Minister is

given a report some three or four months or it may be six months afterwards. However, in relation to the point which the hon. member has brought to my attention, unfortunately nothing of it appears in my file. I will promise the hon. member to take up the matter in the proper quarter, provided that he can supply me with the necessary information or the names of individuals referred to. If he can do that, I will have the matter investigated and have a report made to him at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member for the information which he has given me, but I must sound a note of warning. There are certain irregularities taking place and I would like the Minister to go into the matter and give us the necessary information.

The question the the sum of \$1,042,924 under Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD 38 MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to recommit Head 38 - Medical (2) General Hospital on page 112 of the Estimates.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have asked leave for the recommitment of this Head because I would like to enquire something of the Minister. There is no denying the fact that within recent weeks it has been stated in the Press that there is a lot of dissatisfaction at the General Hospital in connection with the Nurses and the Medical Superintendent. Will the Minister therefore tell us how far he has got with his investigation into these matters? (*Asides*) How can we pass the Estimates dealing with the General Hospital without enquiring into the matter of the threatened strike at that Institution some time ago? There were differences between the Medical Superintendent and the Nurses. I am enquiring how far has the Minister got in connection with this matter; I am just asking that question.

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question asked by the hon. senior member for the City, I will say that I am not in a position to say that there has been anything official as to there being any unrest between the Nurses and the Medical Superintendent of the Barbados General Hospital. I know that there has been some unrest but I cannot say that there has been or that there is unrest between the Nurses and the Medical Superintendent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then who is the unrest between?

Hon. Da.C. EDWARDS: I would like the hon. member to listen to me. All of us are aware that there is some sort of unrest at the General Hospital but I am as anxious to know where the unrest is and the people involved as any other member of the House. The matter is now engaging the attention of the Ministry and investigations are at present being carried out. That is as far as I can go; as soon as we can give any further information on this question, you can rest assured that we will give it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should just like to ask whether the hon. member will give a report as to this unrest for the benefit of hon. members of this House. We do not want to see the patients in the Hospital suffer and we do not want any unrest to take place between the patients and the Nurses or anybody else; however, we are more interested in seeing that the patients at the Hospital do not suffer. Will the Minister make a statement to this House?
10.15 p.m.

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that there is any disharmony between the Minister and any member of his staff. I get on with everybody. I cannot however, make any promise of a statement until investigations are carried out and I have received a Report as a result of the investigations. After I shall have received the Report I will decide what is best for me to do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, I do not take that from any Minister. If it is known that a public row is going on at the Hospital with the staff and doctors, I am not going to accept from the Minister that after he has investigated he will decide what is best to tell this House. After all, we are elected and are entitled to know. There was a blazing headline and pictures in the paper, and it was reported that they threatened to strike. I would not have the Minister tell me that in a public matter which we asked him to investigate that he will decide what is best. I do not expect the Minister to lay a statement until he has got the facts, but when he has got the facts, I expect him to lay them here. We criticised the former Government for doing that, and we do not expect you to follow them by saying that when you get the facts you will decide whether to make them public. The facts are to be made public because it is public money being spent.

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I did not say I would decide whether the facts would be made public. I said I would decide what is best to do. I would like to point out to the hon. member that there are certain matters which may come from the investigation with which the Minister of Social Services can deal. There are other questions which the Minister cannot deal with; for instance, personnel matters; and if from the investigations I find that the matters are personnel matters, I cannot bring a statement to the House; it would be a matter for the Premier. I would like to point out to the hon. member that after the investigation I will decide on what is best to be done, and whether I should bring a statement, whether the Premier should bring a statement, or whether it is a matter for the Cabinet.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have been anxious to ask the Minister to explain the something for the past two weeks, but I know what it is in an Institution like that. I can well imagine if I were on the other side of the Table what the position would be, and for that reason I do not want the members of Parliament to feel that I am causing the Minister any unnecessary embarrassment. The Minister said that he was making investigations and we expect him to say something about them; but when he says he can get on with everybody on earth, he could only be a village idiot and have no ability. I do not know, Sir, but I believe the Leader of the House would like to say something on this. Can you get on with everybody on earth?

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: I can get on even with you.

Mr. MILLER: I am affable and I cannot get on with everybody.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that when the Minister concerned gets the Statement, he should bring it before this House. I want to warn the Government that the public is very anxious to have some knowledge of the facts and circumstances surrounding what they saw in the Press, and they have every confidence that the Minister will make a proper investigation into the matter and lay the facts before this House.

Hon. A. Da.C. EDWARDS: That is exactly what I am doing. I am having a proper investigation carried out.

The question that the sum of \$1,237,240 under Head 38 - Medical (2) General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PART II - CAPITAL ESTIMATES

Part II - Capital Estimates - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are two amounts to the appropriated. Under the Head "Health Services" there is an amount of \$600,000, and under the Head "Agriculture" there is an amount of \$9,330 for Small Holders' Irrigation to be appropriated.

I beg to move that the sums of \$600,000 and \$9,330 be inserted in the Schedule of the Appropriation Bill and stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that I had to be away, and I would be grateful if "1. Annexed Estimates — Post Office" could be recommitted for about five minutes. I want to deal with the question of Postal Services in the parish of St. James which is very important in my opinion. I just want to say something on what has been going on since December, 1961 before the election, and it is something that should be known.

I am therefore asking leave that "Annexed Estimates — Post Office" be recommitted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking that "Annexed Estimates — Post Office" be recommitted, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

10.25 p.m.

Head — 1 Annexed Estimates — Post Office — was recalled.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Now, Sir, I want to make it clear that within the last ten years the postal services of the parish of St. James have been doubled — I believe ten fold — and the same number of postmen there today have been working there for the last ten years. They also have two auxiliary postmen who work during certain periods.

Now, St. Thomas which is a very small parish has six postmen working at their Post Office. St. Lucy has six too, and all the other parishes in the north. With the increased number of people who have come to live in St. James there should be an increase in the number of postmen there. I think that even the Head of the Department has made recommendation for more postmen for that parish. I am saying today what the people of St. James are feeling and I hoping that the appropriate Minister would see to it that the number of postmen in St. James are increased to at least eight and the same two auxiliary postmen employed.

The question that the sum of \$425,248 under Head — 1. Annexed Estimates — Post Office — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the sum of \$19,406,942 under the Draft Estimates, as amended, for the year 1962-63 do now stand part of the Schedule of the Appropriation Bill.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule of the Appropriation Bill as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive, were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing in Committee of the Appropriation Bill, 1962-63 as amended and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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 Appropriation Bill, 1962-63 as amended was read a third time and passed.

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

RESOLUTION FOR \$2,340,351

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution gives formal approval for the issue of advances to meet certain expenditure for which provision is made in the 1962-63 Estimates, Part II — Capital. I want to move in an amendment. The Head "Miscellaneous" Item 1 — Government Offices is increased by \$21,300 so that the total under Head "Miscellaneous" will now be \$175,000 instead of \$153,700. This amendment would make a change in the total to \$2,361,651.

I now beg to move that this Resolution as amended do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
10.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: There are two things of which I would make mention to the Minister. Under the Capital Estimates Head 1, Deep Water Harbour, I would like to see an area reserved at the Deep Water Harbour which can be used as an amusement park for the children and the people of this colony. It would not in any way take anything from the Harbour itself. I do not know how much the Government would be in favour of that. As to the Government Auditorium, I feel that the Government could give consideration to the retention of that. Sometimes when the Government is having its own conferences, this place is away from the noise. There is no suitable place in Bridgetown where you can have a large audience, and that place could be used as an Auditorium. You can have an amusement park down there, and Queen's Park would be able to retain some of its original beauty. There are some things which take away from the beauty of the Park and they could be carried to the Deep Water Harbour.

As far as Housing is concerned, I do not think it is necessary to continue this 10% down payment of the loan and the Government will be well advised to remove that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Which loans?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to the workers' loans. I would also like to suggest to the Government that we must make the people whom we represent have some responsibility. I really think that the time has come when the Government should give serious consideration to passing legislation making it obligatory for people who are granted loans to have this money deducted from their wages. This is like the obligation in respect of Income Tax. The person who wants his house repaired must have an obligation to the man who is lending him the money to repair the house. I feel that if anybody wants to own his own home he should pay for it; you can leave this matter to the legal experts to find a way in which to deal with it. You tell a man that the only way in which he can get a loan is to allow this money to be stopped out of his wages. How do you think this matter works in the United States of America? In the United States of America you make a loan to a person and he agrees that the money or the amount of the loan be taken out of his earnings. When you come to a loan in relation to a Civil Servant, do you not take the money out of his salary? In this case you are telling a man that he is working at Lower Greys or Sunbury and he has to repay the money out of his earnings. These people have to agree to have this money taken out of their earnings.

As to the Development Board, I am hoping that the Government will not adopt the same policy as the last Government, where the Development Board is composed only of

businessmen. There is no place in the world in which you do not include all the important elements. This matter does not affect me, but you cannot see the Workers' Organization given any place on the Development Board and yet you talk about employment. Many of these people to whom we lend this money are anti-Trade Union in their policies and I think it is an essential part of the whole fabric of society that we should have Trade Union representation on this Board, which would reflect an important element of the community.

Relative to the water supplies, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to what I would consider as a condition for the future development of this country. The Government should give thought and study to making the installation of water into houses of all types where water is accessible. If that is not done, you will go on for years and years with this primitive condition where you have standpipes alongside the road and people running to these pipes and wasting their time. You want to erect the houses in such places that water can be installed in them. A house 18' by 10' costs about \$1,000 and how much would it cost to instal water at that house? A child from that 18' by 10' house may be attending Queen's College and the parent of that child does not want it to go to the standpipe in order to fetch water. The average working-class man will own a house for about \$3,000 and what does installing the water at that house cost? You do not want to give the impression to these people that water is not to be installed at these houses. If a man buys lumber from a lumber yard to build a house, he will put windows in his house and what is the cost of doing that? I am not interfering to people who are living in areas which are inaccessible. Some hon. members have been living in Trinidad and they do not see anybody going to the standpipe with a bucket in order to fetch water. You have water installed in people's yards in Port-of-Spain.

Mr. Chairman, I see that the Hon. Minister of Education is not here now, but I think that he delivered a speech at the Coleridge-Parry School. I want to draw to the attention of the Minister that the road which is leading to that school is a positive disgrace. It is a disgrace for a road leading to that school to be in such a condition.
10.45 p.m.

This road cost me some car repairs during the election because it was one of the voting places. Anyone who knows the road leading to the Coleridge-Parry School will tell you that it is a positive disgrace. I do not know how that road leading to one of the leading Secondary Schools in the Island could really remain in that condition for so long.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that they are doing something to the residence of the Headmaster. That house must have been built for a watchman without a family, because I do not know how the Headmaster existed there.

Under Item 7 — Beach Control and Development — I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that we talk a lot today about tourism, and I hope that they will be more enthusiastic about this than the last Government. We have nice beaches in Barbados like the Bathsheba Coast and Rockley Beach, and I would like to see the Government undertaking the task of making these beaches more attractive and putting things down at these beaches for the use of Barbadians. It is not fair for me to take my wife and family to the beach and have to put my wife to undress behind a tree. Anywhere we go I have to tell my wife to duck behind the car door, and I have to stand like a watchman and wait to see if anybody would peep. I feel that there are not enough public beaches, and the ones we have we are going to give away. Soon we will be losing Heywoods. I would like to see a bulwark put down at Bathsheba where you can have a stretch from the Round Rock to the Social Centre which would make it easier for people to enjoy some of the Atlantic breezes. I think all along the sea-coast we should do something about it. We should endeavour to do something in the Northern District, and members would see that I am not against them being given some work to do by having these beaches under their control to see if they would do a good job of them and beautify the Island.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member means "give them more work".

Mr. WALCOTT: I accept the correction. Under Head 8, I would like to take the Minister of Communications through Boscobelle and the roads leading through The Risk and Graveyard — Graveyard is part of St. Lucy and part of St. Peter, and some of my constituents live in Graveyard, St. Peter and some in Graveyard, St. Lucy — and Indian Ground where the buses pass and show him that we can open up the road that leads to Sedgepond, and have a wider by-pass along there. I hope the Minister will give some attention to these things.

Under Head 9 — Miscellaneous — I would like to ask the Minister to examine the possibility of erecting proper offices at the Deep Water Harbour. I have nothing against the preservation of Pelican Island, but the building for Pelican Island is unsuitable for an office. The Port Services are being carried on there and then you have the duplication of an office on the Wharf where the old Shipping Office was, and that is a positive waste of money. I do not see the necessity of having an office on the Wharf and one at the Deep Water Harbour, because the work done up here can be done at that point. I do not know if the Government is still in favour of having a Police Station there. If you can build a Police Station down there, it seems to me that you can erect a building for the Port Services as distinct from the Port Contractors. The offices for the Port Manager and his staff are unsuitable, and though you might preserve Pelican Island, the offices are out of keeping with what is required.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I know that all hon. members have something to say, but at this stage we are going to have to adjourn and come back on Friday to finish the Estimates. It is impossible for us to carry on any longer, because we have a Cabinet Meeting tomorrow at 9.30 a.m. and none of us has had time to look at the Agenda yet. We have to go home now and spend time on a voluminous Agenda for tomorrow morning. Some of these things can stay for another time as we cannot go on any longer. We only got the Cabinet Agenda in here tonight and we have not yet seen it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Who says the Cabinet must meet tomorrow?

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know is if the hon. member is objecting to what I am going to say, because he does not know what I am going to say. I do not want the Minister to get in his head that I want to get up here and talk because I can talk. What I have to say is something pertinent, and I am sure he will agree with what I am going to say.

What I want to draw to the Minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, is that I do not see any justification for that Brandenburg Gate at the Deep Water Harbour. If we must have a gate to control people from flowing in and out of the Deep Water Harbour, there is no reason why it could not be removed much closer to the Customs Building. It would serve a useful purpose because people go there from far to see their loved ones off only to discover when they get by the Brandenburg gate that they have to leave their family there as they do not have a pass. The Police specifically state that you have to get a pass and you therefore have to go to the Agents to get one. There is also a law there — and this Government has not got to apologise for this — that if a seaman is coming through anytime after 7 o'clock at night, he is supposed to get out of the taxi and take his luggage down to the ship. It is only the goodness of the Police that cars are allowed to go through after 7 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, I am bringing this to the attention of my Government now. When does the Minister want me to bring it; next year? I am not going to tolerate that from any person in here. When I stand up to speak, I speak on something tangible. No member in here had votes from two parishes; he had the same one parish as any one else, and I am not going to tolerate that nonsense. I am appealing here, Sir, on behalf of the many people in Barbados. It is hard to ask the Barbadian taxpayers to pay \$31 million for something only to be segregated from it. I am appealing therefore to the Minister to remove the gate or the Policemen, or build a gate lower, because I would not like people to obstruct the work.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has travelled extensively all over the world, and he should know that all Ports should be restricted areas. The hon. member has been to Trinidad and should know what it is there.
10.55 p.m.

Sir, you cannot keep jurisdiction over a Port or Harbour unless it is a restricted area. I quite agree that there should be some Police Post for cars to facilitate seamen and other people going into the Port, but to talk about removing the gate from the Harbour is completely out of any reason with a Harbour that costs \$31 million and all sorts of money like that to be left open. In compensation, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, we have decided to reserve an area for a park and it is now under consideration. We are going to leave some of the sheds which were there for the Trade Fair and put up some amusements for children there.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has called that gate the Brandenburg Gate, but you must have a gate there.

Mr. BOXILL: I think the Hon. Minister missed the point. I never said that there should be no restriction; I said that the gate should be removed closer to the Customs Building because it would facilitate those people who go there to see their loved ones for the last time. It is very hard when some relative of yours is going away and you have to stand all that way outside in the sun and rain and cannot be near to them.

I am glad that the Hon. Minister mentioned that it is so all over the world. I have been to Jamaica where they have greater employment than here and the people there can go in on the waterfront. I am only advocating that the gate should be removed closer to the Customs Department so that the people would be able to get a little closer behind instead of being two or three miles off.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am glad that the Hon. Minister raised that point. That sounds very well but in practice it cannot work. It just depends on the size of the Port. The hon. member must know that it is not only a Port but you also do bunkering there. I have been on a railway which in order for a passenger to get to it you had to carry your baggage for such a long distance that before you get to it you became sick. When you go to the railway ticket office and you buy your ticket, the amount of walking which you had to do to get to the train with your baggage would make you sick. You have to walk with your baggage until your hands get cramp.

People must be prepared to suffer the inconvenience which a restricted area entails, and people who are leaving the Island must be prepared to have the inconvenience of getting their things down to the boat themselves. The people who come to see them off cannot go with them to the boat. It is a restricted area and hon. members must bear in mind that the majority of your cargo is landed there. You cannot have a gate there for some people to come in and go out like that. The workers have to go in there to work and when they pass through the gate they then have to walk to the ship which is a fair distance. If you put the gate closer, there would be congestion from the traffic that goes in there because you have a lot of lorries and trucks drawing cargo.

There is too much of this talk that people want to have the convenience of going to see their loved ones off. You have to set a distance where you are going to see them for the last. I know from my travelling that the distance in some places is far greater than what it is here. You have to stay a long way off and then you do not even see them for the last time because they are carried away in a chute. You go through something until you get into a plane. You must bear in mind that it is a restricted area. When it comes to that, I have absolutely no sympathy for my mother. I have to reach a point where I must wish them goodbye. Sir, I am one man who feels that it would be more difficult to land cargo today if you allow people to get nearer to the Port. It is a Port; it is not a picnic place. It is not like Seawall Airport where people go for a drive. If you have to wish your relatives goodbye at the gate, what is wrong with that?

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$2,361,651 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and the House divided as follows:

AYES: Mr. BATSON Honourables J. C. TUDOR, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. WEEKES, LOWE, YEARWOOD, CARMICHAEL, BOXILL, WALCOTT, MILLER, SEALY, LYNCH and MOTTLEY - 16.

11.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to this House that what I have observed and what the Clerk has confirmed, is that there has been a breach of Standing Order No. 37 (7)? That paragraph of the Standing Order reads as follows:-

"When a Member's name is called by the Clerk at a division, the Member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes". A Member shall not answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he may have expressed when the voices were taken collectively."

When the voices were taken collectively, it was clear to me - and I am fortified in that view by the opinion of the Clerk - that the hon. junior member for St. George voted "No".

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I said "No" to something else.

Mr. SPEAKER: There was only one question then before the Chamber. In the circumstances, I have no alternative but to direct that the vote of the hon. junior member for St. George be recorded as when the voices were taken collectively and when he voted "No". The result of the vote therefore is that fifteen hon. members voted "Aye" and one hon. member voted "No". Accordingly I declare that the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I accept the ruling of the Chair but unfortunately the Speaker did not look at this side of the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution be now read a second time. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I declare that the "Ayes" have it.

The question that this Resolution be now agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, since the Other Place has to meet next Tuesday for the purpose of considering the Draft Estimates, we are contemplating that we should meet on Thursday next in the afternoon. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 29th March, 1962, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 29th March, 1962 at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
11.15 p.m.