
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd October, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Esq., Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (*Premier*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the 9th October, 1962, have been circulated to hon. members. Unless there is any objection, these Minutes will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare these Minutes duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have been instructed to lay an account of the transactions in rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the quarter ended 30th September, 1962;

Also, Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th June, 1962.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, I am instructed to lay the Barbados Harbours (Amendment) Regulations, 1962.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to offer an excuse to hon. members for the late arrival of the Clerk of the House who, I understand, is unavoidably delayed. The Deputy Clerk is carrying on until the Clerk's arrival and, for his sake, as well.

PETITION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Petition of the Rev. Thomas Pearson, S.J. and others, praying the House to introduce a Bill to authorise them to hold

lands in this Island under the name of Trustees for Roman Catholic purposes registered.

The Bill is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

I have two petitions to present to the House and I cannot get them at all. This is not the sort of thing which should go on in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's point is made. As soon as copies of the Petitions are available, I will ask the leave of the House for the hon. member to present them, even though they may be presented out of turn.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$6,059 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I - Current as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 23, which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$133,188 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I - Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, Resolution to place the sum of \$6,947 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part II - Capital as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 24, which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill further to amend the Trustees Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902.

I will be asking leave to deal with this Bill in all its stages later today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask that copies of it be circulated.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir.
12.25 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to incorporate the Trustees for Roman Catholic purposes as a Trust Corporation.

QUESTIONS

The following Notices of Questions were given:—

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Is Government aware of the unnecessary expense and inconvenience that parents of children who attend Government Schools are experiencing from time to time in obtaining books that are changed more often than necessary?

Will Government investigate the matter with a view to having all textbooks used in Government Schools standardised and so far as possible, uniform?

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware of the unsatisfactory condition of the road known as Horton Road in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government seek to make the necessary repairs with as little delay as possible?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is it a fact that lorry drivers and other employees of the Department of Highways and Transport have not been receiving their annual vacation with pay?

2. Is it a fact that there is no money available to pay the said holiday-with-pay claims?

3. If the answers to Questions 1 and 2 above are in the affirmative, will Government state why?

Mr. MOTTLEY: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government as soon as practicable cause a Commission of Enquiry to be instituted into the case of the death of Mr. Arnie Greaves, who was hospitalised as a result of burns received from the fire on board the M. V. Daerwood?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. Michael to sell certain lands to the Trustees of Kensington Cricket Grounds, and to grant certain other lands to the Executive Committee of this island.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902, be now read a first time.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled an Act to incorporate the Trustees for Roman Catholic purposes as a Trust Corporation, be now read a first time.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

NOTICE OF LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal later in the day with the Resolution for the sum of \$133,188, of which notice was given earlier, in all of its stages today. Copies of the Resolution will be circulated amongst hon. members.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. A Question was tabled today by the hon. senior mem-

ber for the City asking for some investigation into the unfortunate death of a person on board a ship within the jurisdiction of the Magistrate of District "A". Recently several questions have come to my attention as the Minister of Home Affairs, which are particularly matters relating to the Law Courts and Local Government, questions which are clearly set out in May's as not to be of the type which should be allowed at all. I would caution hon. members that if they persist in asking questions which we feel would be a usurpation of the functions of the Courts or the Local Government Authorities they will not get any answers. In fact, they will only get answers indicating that these matters are not strictly within the competence of the Ministers. We do not intend to disregard the rule of law which a lot of people in this island of Barbados seem to have a healthy disregard for. We intend to preserve the rule of law in this country. I would only ask Your Honour to ask the Clerk to be a little more careful before he accepts questions relating to matters which are beyond the jurisdiction and control of Parliament itself. While a matter is being investigated by the Courts, it is almost contempt to have Parliament to refer to that matter. We have absolutely no intention of interfering with the free exercise of the discretion of the Courts whether they be Coroners' Courts or Courts of competent jurisdiction within the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot allow any discussion on this matter. I would just like to say, in respect of this particular question, that the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown requested that the Government cause a Commission of Enquiry to be instituted into the case of the death of this gentleman, without there being any reference or allusion whatsoever to any legal proceedings. I only make that brief comment.
12.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want to carry on this, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to make my position clear. I do feel it is the duty of the Clerk to investigate and advise Your Honour whether there is a legal investigation pending before a question like that is allowed, because it is a matter of public and general knowledge that the unfortunate deaths of those persons have been the subject of Coroners' investigations. All I am saying is that it is the duty of the Clerk to advise Your Honour as to whether or not this matter is before the Courts. I quite appreciate that Your Honour is not in a position to know merely from the form of the questions, neither are you deemed to take judicial notice of whether or not investigations are pending; but I do feel that Your Honour and Ministers can be protected by being properly advised by the Clerk whether or not there are such proceedings pending.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to authorise the Executive Committee to execute leases of certain properties in London and in Montreal for use by the Commissions set up in those countries by the Regional Council of Ministers.

RESOLUTION re LEASES OF PROPERTIES IN LONDON AND MONTREAL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, it is one of the constitutional safeguards enshrined in the Executive Committee Act and the other instruments pertaining to the constitution of this Island that public property should neither be acquired or disposed of whether by gift, lease, sale or otherwise unless it is done with the express permission and authorisation of Parliament. It is hardly necessary for me to remind Your Honour of this, being the custodian, as it were, of the constitutional rights of the subjects of this Island as you are; but this is a safeguard which has been honoured in the past and regarded more in its breach than in its observance.

Some people may think that a Resolution of this kind is unnecessary because we are not coming to the House to ask for any money. The House has already voted money for this and other particular purposes. The purpose of this Resolution, of course, is to further the avowed intention of the Governments of eight territories in the Caribbean ex-

pressed at the London Conference held between 9th May and 24th May, 1962, to establish a Federal system of Government for these Islands. I can say that in respect of both of these premises that the necessity to acquire premises of this nature exists independent of the question of Federation. As far back as between 1932 and 1933, I believe it was, after the Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, the Governments of the West Indian territories got together, and it was round about this time, perhaps, that agitation first began for Federation and improperly sprung out of the necessity to work together as had been evinced by the successors of the Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement talks, and they decided to establish a representative office in the Dominion of Canada in the City of Montreal.

It was some twenty-five years later that the political representatives decided to take a step further and establish a Federal system of Government for ten territories in the Eastern Caribbean; but in this exercise there were twelve territories involved. There were the ten territories which comprised the West Indies Federation from 1958 until its unlamented demise in 1962, and there were the neighbouring territories of British Honduras and British Guiana now on the verge of independence, because there are independence talks going on at Lancaster House in London at the moment.

When the West Indies Federation came to a sudden end, it was necessary for the office to be disbanded, and the representation which trade and commerce, students and migrants had been accustomed to expect from this office in the City of Montreal was abruptly terminated. On the 30th September, the office which had been occupied by the West Indies High Commissioner in Canada was closed down, the staff was disbanded and the representation ceased. At the present moment, therefore, after more than twenty-eight or perhaps thirty years of existence, the link between the West Indian people and the Canadian citizens and exporters and importers was suddenly broken.

12.45 p.m.

It was in anticipation of the establishment of an institution or office to carry on the work which we considered was so vitally necessary for the safeguarding of the interest of West Indian Trade, students and people in the Dominion of Canada that the Chief Minister of St. Kitts and I at the request of the Regional Council of Ministers went over to Canada at the end of last month and discussed the problems arising out of the closing down of the West Indies High Commissioner's Office in Montreal, both with the gentleman who had ably filled the post of High Commissioner — Trade Commissioner in the first instance and in the later stages High Commissioner of the Federal Government. That gentleman, Mr. Stollmeyer, with other members of his staff and other interested parties along with the Chief Minister of St. Kitts and I discussed the question of the establishment of a new office to project an image of the Eastern Caribbean and to safeguard the interest which had been so ably done during the past years.

I consider that we were extremely lucky in being able to find the premises which were recommended to the Regional Council of Ministers which met in October, 1962, and they were endorsed and approved by the Council.

It is always better to see these things at first hand and I can safely say that the accommodation, though rather small, is none the less adequate and in keeping, at least up to the standard of the office accommodation which the Federal Government had maintained during the whole of its existence as its High Commissioner's office in Montreal. The office is approximately 50 yards away from the old Commissioner's office, about 400 yards from the McGill University, about ten feet from Sir George Williams College, which I understand is now a University, about 50 yards away from the main shopping street in Montreal — St. Catherine Street — and it is close to the services of four or five banks on that same street. It possesses all the characteristics which we think that a Commissioner's office should possess.

The remarkable thing about the accommodation, the amount of office space which we have been able to select

is the rent which we may be called upon to pay. Of course, the rent is to be divided on a mandatory level in the first instance between the contributing territories. The rent is less than \$6,000 (B.W.L.) per annum and that rental includes central heating, air conditioning and it also includes rates and taxes with the proviso that if the rates and taxes rise over and above the level which presently obtain, the difference would be met by the West Indian Governments. In other words, what that means is that if the rates and taxes are raised, we would be expected to pay our proportionate share; but as far as I can see the rates and taxes in the municipality of Montreal do not exhibit the same fractious tendency as they do in the Local Government of Barbados; so I do not think we should be duly alarmed about that.

We have every reason to be satisfied and I do not think anyone would challenge the necessity, whether there is a Federation or not, for our students to have a place like this where they can go, where they can have their business arranged if they have difficulty with their University and where they can have their problems threshed out.

Sir, I referred to the years during which we have been represented with very satisfactory results from this service in the Dominion of Canada. The period is over thirty years. Our trade in one direction is of the order of \$7 million in Barbados alone and this trade has been built up and has been expanded. It has been developed right over a period of time and I think it would be extremely unfortunate on the grounds of economy where you have 800,000 people and probably a sum in the vicinity of \$20 million to deal with for anyone to challenge the necessity of having somewhere where businessmen and West Indian students can have easy access in order to get information.

I will give some detail of the acquisition and the signing of the leases. That is a question which may somewhat be uppermost in the minds of hon. members. I shall explain that the Government of Trinidad from the time we set up that office looked after the signing of leases and the annual budget of the Trade Commissioner's Office in Canada. The Government of Trinidad collected the contributions from the other eleven territories and this arrangement proved to be quite a satisfactory one. In view of the fact that the Regional Council of Ministers nor the Governments of the seven or eight territories which have decided to form an Eastern Caribbean Federation have at present legal personality, hon. members will appreciate it will be necessary for some projective or prospective member Government to enter into their undertakings on behalf of the rest. It is nothing new; it is not a departure from former practice. As a matter of fact, it is merely a logical development and imitation of former practice. It is indeed history repeating itself, because in 1932 or thereabouts, when the West Indian Governments decided to have this place in Canada, the Government of Trinidad looked after it on behalf of the other Governments.

A similar problem exists with the acquisition of premises in the United Kingdom. There is a feeling among West Indians in the United Kingdom and there is a definite expression of opinion from the leaders of the Governments of the Eastern Caribbean territories — and I do not want to be too critical of any individual; I am just speaking of a system.

12.55 p.m.

There is this opinion and feeling that the office of the West Indies High Commissioner in London is almost inaccessible to the average immigrant in the United Kingdom from the West Indies. There was also the feeling that the office was run on an extravagant and unrealistic scale, not due in any way to the predilections of the gentleman who occupied the office of Trade Commissioner but because that was the system instituted by the former Federal Government. The former office was situated possibly in the most fashionable and expensive quarter of London; it was literally within a stone's throw of Berkeley Square because it was separated from Berkeley's Square only by the Rolls Royce Rooms. It was a very expensive property. The feeling was created that the West Indies Government was trying to compete with the United States Government, which was

about 150 yards away in Grosvenor Square, and it was trying to catch up in the same kind of elevated company, trying to put up a show which would do justice to any of the wealthier industrial nations, while most of their immigrants were languishing in deplorable housing conditions and people in the West Indies were without jobs.

We cannot project that kind of thing. When the Hon. Minister of Labour, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I were at the Marlborough House Conference along with some of the other Ministers from the other territories, we investigated this problem and came to the solemn decision that it would be undesirable for us to try to aspire to the same line of extravagance that the former Federal Government enjoyed at the expense of the taxpayers of this island. We also felt, after paying several visits to the districts such as North Kensington, Brixton and other districts where West Indians tended to be concentrated, that an office could be within reasonable distance of these centres of West Indian population, that the office should also provide facilities and amenities which would make the West Indian immigrant and the average West Indian Student crowd at the premises and that it should provide these amenities, amenities which the former office did not adequately provide or did not provide at all. We experienced some difficulty in getting our ideas across, in getting people to accept that this was a new image which we wanted to create, and not the old image of well-being and general affluence which pervaded the atmosphere. The Chief Minister of St. Kitts and I were delegated by the Regional Council of Ministers to inspect premises, bearing in mind the characteristics and qualifications which the Ministers generally felt - and this was agreed to by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - that representative premises should possess. We paid visits to several premises in London within the radius of action by which we were restricted in our terms of reference, and that radius of action was really confined to the district of Kensington and possibly Victoria. We felt that that was a sort of geographical focal point. We visited all of these districts and, taking into consideration the accessible underground and bus transportation, and bearing in mind all the other factors such as appearance and adequacy of space, we eventually recommended to the Regional Council of Ministers a property which was fortunately available in 229-231 Kensington High Street, an area which is not foreign to delegations and ambassadorial residences.

Mr. Speaker, no one could challenge the suitability of Kensington High Street from the point of view that other delegations would not think of using Kensington High Street. It is also interesting to note that the first office of the West Indies High Commission that the Federal Government occupied in the City of London before their aspirations exceeded the competence of the West Indian people to support an elaborate set up - the first office occupied by that Commission was also in Kensington High Street and therefore again history has repeated itself. The Barbados Government has decided to ask the Legislature to permit us again in this instance to act as the signatory to the lease which is available. Figures have been quoted there but we are still negotiating through the auspices of the Crown Agents for Commonwealth Territories over the precise terms of the lease and I do not think that the figures which have been quoted there are likely to be the actual figures. We are still negotiating for the furniture and the amount of the lease. In this respect we also expect and it has been decided that the other territories participating in this exercise will make contributions on the basis of a mandatory levy in the first instance. Someone with a legal personality recognizable by law, has got to take the responsibility of signing these leases and we are merely asking the permission of the Legislature to do so.

1.05 p.m.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, and ask for the approval of the Resolution, I think I can disclose that the Manager of the Tourist Board in Barbados also inspected the premises, and following up a suggestion made by the Minister of Trade, Labour and Tourism and by me jointly to him some time earlier, he has decided to recommend to the Barbados Tourist Board that they lease or sublet part of

the premises from the territorial Governments. It would be under the province of the Government of Barbados, and you will have heard me state before, Sir, on previous occasions that it was the intention of the Government of Barbados to establish a branch of the Government Savings Bank in London, and I am very proud to say that I think that the premises which we have selected come up to all the requirements that one would expect from a banking institution, even down to doors made of bronze.

As a matter of fact, when I first saw the premises just by chance, I mentioned to the Chief Minister of St. Kitts that it would appear that there were premises available on top of that bank; and when we made further investigations, we found that the whole building was available including the premises which I originally misconstrued to be a banking institution. I think all these circumstances have been fortuitous that the availability of the leases of such premises should have coincided with the visit of the Chief Minister of St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla, the Unitary State as Mr. Southwell is fond of calling it - and myself to London and to Montreal.

I do not think there is anything more I can usefully add except that it is also proposed to merge the Barbados Migrants' Liaison Service with the Commission in London. We will effect considerable savings as a Government which unfortunately is not taken to kindly by some of the other territories, but it is unavoidable. We will effect savings of \$11,000 to \$12,000 a year by using this accommodation and by giving up the lease of the premises which we now hold from the Crown Agents in Milbank; and I think the premises which the Migrants Service will be moving into will be much more accessible to migrants, because the migrants are already making pilgrimages on afternoon after work to see the office, and are spreading the good work that at long last they are going to have a place that the West Indians in London can be proud of. The Students' Liaison Service of course, will also be merged, and it is not proposed at this stage to have a Trade Department, thereby effecting another considerable saving. We feel, when the Federation is established, that will be perhaps sufficient time at which we should consider the establishment of a trade section in the Commission Services in London. Although this was recommended by the past High Commissioner and tentatively at one time approved by the Financial section of the Colonial Office, we have since voluntarily deleted this item of expenditure ourselves in the Regional Council of Ministers on the recommendation of the Chairman and the Chief Minister of St. Kitts and myself, and I think therefore, Sir, that no one can say that the present West Indian Governments are not getting down to earth to tackle the problems with which they are confronted, having in mind all the time the restrictive financial limitations which are imposed upon us by the circumstances in which we live.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the Hon. Premier in his very comprehensive survey of this situation, and I do not think that any opposition can be offered one way or the other in this respect. Speaking first of Canada, I think I wholeheartedly agree with him, though I have not been to Montreal for many years. The area which he has described aptly fits the situation, and I believe myself, as the Premier has mentioned, that the premises are about ten minutes' walk from Sir George Williams College which I am told has University status. That is an area which I know well enough, and I do not see we can do anything but offer our best wishes to the Government, and hope that this will really meet the situation in Canada.

It has always been felt that whether or not we continued in a Federation, this was a service which had to be carried on for the eight territories or for such territories as came together, especially in Canada. I believe it was also felt that due to our economic position such a service might not be necessary because of the family relationships and the

number of people from these Islands in New York State proper, though you would have a tremendous lot more people there from these Islands than in Canada. The position has been set out clearly here in the Addendum, and I can endorse what the Hon. Premier has said in respect of what I saw in London. It is abundantly clear that the premises in London did not lend itself to the availability of those people who would need to make use of this service from the point of view that it repelled them. When I myself knowing nothing of London, was taken there by the Premier and was taken to the area, sometimes I saw as many as forty people around the Premier discussing matters, and it was abundantly clear that they knew nothing of the service because it was so far removed from the areas in which they lived. There were those people who seemed to be leaders in these areas who had been pressing the Premier that something should be done within the area which people could very well find and could have things done for them. I am happy to think that the suggestion has now borne fruit in this manner.

1.15 p.m.

There are one or two questions which I would like to ask the Hon. Premier. I know that there is a question of there being more leasehold than freehold properties; but do you not think it would be better and more economical to acquire a property by way of purchase rather than by lease? I ask that although I notice that there is a slight trek of West Indians coming back home, but I do not think there will be any large trek back here. I quite understand what the Hon. Premier meant when he referred to "legal personality". Under the circumstances, I agree that some Government would have to take the lead and there would be some Government having to do some signing as there would be a question of some signing to be done and I do appreciate that Barbados would have to take the lead in this respect.

You find some people saying today that there is great opportunity to our migrants in England and tomorrow you hear somebody else saying the opposite. I have been to England. If you take the average working man that has gone there, despite the fact that he finds living conditions what they are, you find him spending something like £4 a week on food. When we were there, we watched them going into stores and buying things. They said to us that they were getting on all right; the only thing which they found hard to get was some place to live. I cannot see myself your having any great exodus of West Indians from England; therefore what you are doing here has to be done.

Although it was my first visit to London, I say that it was unfortunate where this place was sited before. I saw it myself. I thought it was too far removed from West Indians who wanted to get in touch with some legal representatives. I say that the expenditure on that place was a waste of time; it was reckless expenditure. I say that with the greatest respect to the gentleman who was the head and who with dignity represented the West Indies.

I am very glad to see that the Hon. Premier and the Chief Minister of St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla for whom I have a very high regard for his soundness and his approach to things, fully realise that we should have a service which would reach these people on certain grounds.

Sir, I have the greatest praise for this Government in making this selection. I went with the Hon. Premier on this tour of this place. I have but one question to ask him on this matter and it is a simple question of whether he thinks it would be more profitable to acquire the premises by purchase or to pay \$500 (B. W. L.) per month for rent. As regards the premises in Canada, I wonder if he can give me a fuller description of that property.

The Hon. Premier said that of course the rates and taxes on property in Montreal do not fluctuate as they do in this country by the Local Governments. I know that it is not like here. I know the Local Government set up in Montreal is not like the City Council. However, my question is this: "Would it be more profitable to acquire this building in England by purchase than it would be to pay the rent of

\$500 which according to the Hon. Premier seems extremely cheap? As far as the premises in Canada is concerned, will the Hon. Premier tell us what size the building is? Is it only the ground floor of a building, the entire area or what is it? We on this side of the Table feel, whether you are having the "Eight" or no "Eight", with the number of students in Canada and West Indies going to Britain, that this is a service which should be carried on by West Indian Governments themselves and should be paid for by them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, "Eight" or no "Eight", "Seven" or no "Seven", "One" or no "One", what I would like to know from the Hon. Premier is this. First of all, let me say that I am not disagreeing with the principle of the Resolution; I am not disagreeing with the principle as far as Federation is concerned; but it is a question of economy which we have to deal with, and therefore, we have to be very careful. The Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:

"The property is at present leased at £4,250 (£20,400) per annum, but this amount is likely to be doubled after June 1963 when the term of the present lease comes to an end. A new lease will then be granted for seven years. The available accommodation however, will be excessive and it is proposed to sub-let a portion of the premises. It is estimated that about three-quarters of the rental could be recouped in this manner. In addition a premium of (\$48,000) has been quoted. This represents mainly the cost of fixtures, furniture and equipment in the building, the last two of which will become the property of Barbados."

Now, Sir, we are being called upon today to give approval to the present Government to sign a lease for these particular buildings. No business man who knows what he is doing is going to sign a lease for a building or property without knowing the actual cost because you may go and commit yourself to an amount which in truth and in fact you may not be able to pay.

1.25 p.m.

You may not be able to pay because the Premier says that he was not yet sure about the actual cost.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I never said any such thing; I never made any reference or statement to the effect that I do not know what is the actual cost. What I did say was that the figures quoted to us by the Crown Agents are in the Addendum to the Resolution but negotiations are in progress whereby the cost may be reduced; but we have come to the House with the maximum possible amount we have to pay. It is on the basis of these figures that I am asking the House to approve this Resolution, not on the basis of the hypothetical figures. I should just like to correct the hon. member on that.

Mr. SMITH: I would still like to know from the Hon. Premier, before the Resolution is passed, how much will the amount for Barbados be and how much the other territories will have to pay. That is the point I wanted to make. As the hon. senior member for the City has said, somebody has to make a start; however, if we are going forward and are undertaking to do everything, the other boys are not committed to anything and there is the possibility of Barbados being left with the bag to hold. It is a question of money that we are talking about and I feel that we should know, even before we agree to this Resolution what the breakdown is. It is not only Barbados which is taking part in this matter, but it is a question of the other seven, the other Six or the other Two. We should know that we are giving the Government permission to sign the leases and to carry on, but we will not be knowing what our part will be. We may be faced with the most of it and what can we say then? We will have to say "ting bop; too late to look". No businessman would do that. We are dealing with more than one territory, and therefore we should know what the position is. We are now facing the music to do everything.

Mr. Speaker, it is only the other day that I read in the newspaper that there was a complaint that Barbados wanted to dominate the whole thing; they are not saying that Barbados wants to shoulder the most of it, but that we want to dominate the whole thing. That is where we will get dis-

satisfaction. I know that there are some people who, when the worries are there, do not know you, but when everything is ready, then they know you. Barbados is doing everything and the others are nothing to do with that; but when it is a question of seats they will know that it is not fair to them that Barbados should want to have everything. Since everybody is thinking about himself and this person wants to have this and that and he is not thinking about the trouble there is where we will find ourselves in the trouble. That was the same thing which happened with the last Federation and we should not try to drop into this same thing again.

Up to now, the Premier has not told us how much this thing is likely to cost each territory; we should be told that, not that we should just go ahead and sign the lease for this place like that. It is set out there that you can sublet these premises, but the Premier cannot guarantee the subletting of these premises because he has to know if anybody will rent a part of the premises first. Speaking under correction, it appears as if only one quarter of them will do for us; but when we have signed for these premises and nobody else comes along, then we will have to pay everything. I would like to know if the Premier is sure about subletting these premises; otherwise he is taking a chance. He will have to charge a rent which these people who may be willing to take part of these premises will be able to pay. This money seems to be a lot of money; I cannot even call the figures, far less reckon the money. Up to now, we are not sure about Federation because every morning we are reading something else. I am sure about Barbados, but I am not sure about the Federation. In the role which Barbados is taking, it seems to me that we are right, but the small boys are still looking back and studying and they are still afraid of Barbados because they feel that Barbados wants the most of the pudding. I think that the Government should travel very slowly in this matter and do not try to commit us to anything which would harm us.

The hon. senior member for the City said that he has not seen anything to criticise or disagree with; therefore he knows what it is; but he has tabled an amendment to the Resolution dealing with the White Paper in which he has his fears and that he would not like, or that it would not cause, our living standards to go down. The hon. member had his fears then and I do not know if he still has them now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my fear is always there when it comes to the expenditure of money. I will always have fears in that regard because I am a Conservative and a realist. What I said was that, with the number of Barbadians alone in England and the numbers I know to be in Canada, we have to provide some place like this. If the other territories join us, that is all well and good; but whether they join us or not, this service will be an essential service to Barbados.
1.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact, I remember being in here when there was no Federation at all, but there was the idea of providing a place for Students. Now you have thousands of dollars, do you want to tell me that you are not going to provide a place?

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been clearly elucidated.

Mr. SMITH: I am not saying anything at all about Canada, because for my part I will go along with Canada now. The money seems small to me as far as the rent for the premises in Canada is concerned. I may be termed foolish, but if I had the authority to take my country somewhere in a Federation, I would go along with Canada. With respect to the other amount, Sir, there was a time when the last Government brought a Resolution to buy a place in England for the Liaison Officer whom I heard was doing a good job, fighting the cause of our people in England and seeing about getting jobs for them, but the criticism of the Opposition then was that the Government was throwing away money in buying a building of that sort. If things should cease tomorrow, the Government would have the chance of selling the building, and I suppose they would get more for it than was paid for it. The building in this Resolution is to be leased;

so the Liaison Officer will fight the cause of the people in a higher bracket. I want to know if the Opposition was sincere when they criticised and made the people of this country believe that the last Government was throwing away money by buying this property, while they are now seeking permission to lease a place for all this money.

Mr. Speaker, if the Resolution before us was seeking to buy a place, it would be different, because if you buy something too expensive, it is still yours. In other words, you never buy a property too expensive today, because you can give one dollar for a thing and get \$1,000 for it; but I think it was part of the platform of this present Government in the last election when they told the people that there were so many hungry people in Barbados, the Government could not find money to provide work for them, and yet they were spending all that money to buy a place for one man. That is politics; but I wonder what they would say now if I said that there are so many people now unemployed, and there is no money to employ them. I have just tabled a question because some Department cannot give holidays with pay since there is no money to pay these people.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I very much deprecate the hon. member asking Ministers questions and in the course of a debate in a most irrelevant and unnecessary statement pointing out that there is no money to pay somebody. If he knows that, he must know where the money is, because I think he was asking a question and he will get a reply to that question in due course. As a matter of fact, you will see that the Hon. Minister of Communications has tabled a Resolution here today for money for sick and other vacation leave for the same Department that he asked about. He does not even wait to study the Resolution before him, but the hon. member in his inimitable style is getting swept away by his own record. I would ask him to refrain, if he has asked a question, from making statements on the same question he is asking. He should at least wait until the Minister has had an opportunity to reply before he makes statements like that which are completely false and completely untrue, as he must very well know.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is the Premier of Barbados. He said I would not wait and that the Minister tabled a Resolution. The Minister did not say what the Resolution was for, because if he had done so I would not be so simple as to get up and say anything. I am very unhappy about these replies because up to last Tuesday I asked the same Minister a question, and when the Minister was willing to reply, about two faces held over to him and the Minister sat down and refused to answer; so there is no certainty that I would get a proper reply when I ask a question. When it comes to that, I can only say that there are some people who live in glass houses but believe in throwing stones. Mr. Speaker, I believe what brought the Minister to his feet was when I said that the last Government was accused of throwing away money on this building rather than helping the poor people of this country, and when I further said: "Suppose I accused the present Government of doing the same thing or even worse." I am sure that during the last Government's term of office I never heard one complaint from people not getting their holiday with pay. They all got it, I believe; so this Government is worse, if it is a fact.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again I must rise on a point of order, because I would have to tell the hon. member some very harsh overtures if he persists in making inflammatory statements like that purely for the benefit of the Press because it is quite untrue and he knows it is untrue.
1.45 p.m.

The Hon. Minister will reply to him in due course; but the hon. member should not use this debate on the acquisition of premises for the needs of West Indians in London to say what he is saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: I counsel the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to steer clear of making those statements until a more appropriate time. You may make an analogy to these two premises.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, I will; but when the Hon. Premier tells me that he will be harsh, I want him to know that he cannot be more harsh than I. Let him start, if he wants.

Mr. SPEAKER: He will not attempt to start with me in the Chair and I hope the hon. member would not try to embarrass him.

Mr. SMITH: No Sir, but I am willing and ready at any time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Outside: not in here.

Mr. SMITH: This is my reply. Anytime I lose my seat, I still have something behind my name. If the Hon. Minister loses his seat, he has nothing more. They are only there for now at the mercies of the people.

What I would like to know from the Hon. Premier, if he is in a position to let me know; can he give me some idea of what is the mandatory levy on the other territories? What will be Barbados' share of this amount? Let us know something because I am taking this from a business point of view. No businessman or woman would go and commit himself or herself to the leasing of property until he knows what the property is likely to cost. The Hon. Premier said that it is a possibility that it would cost so much. That is a possibility; you do not know directly.

Taking it from the Addendum, it does not appear as if you want the whole of these premises but that you can get some money by sub-letting. That means that you are going to lease this place for a certain amount with the hope and at the mercies of other people to help you to pay for it by sub-letting from you. We would have to figure on the whole amount of the lease of the building for the moment, and what each territory would have to contribute if we do not succeed in getting the other part of the premises sub-let. If we do not succeed in getting the other premises sub-let, it should be stated that our part of the rent would be say \$10 a month; but if we succeed in getting it sub-let, our part would be \$4.00 per month. Sir, until the Hon. Premier can give me a breakdown, I am very unhappy; it would be unbusinesslike. In other words, I will be acting as one who is not a businessman. This is agreeing to a lease and not knowing what is the outcome until after the lease.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the hon. junior member for the City gets up to speak, Mr. Speaker, there are two Resolutions which were passed last week as No. 19 and No. 20 respectively but they have been incorrectly numbered. The Resolution numbered No. 19 should be numbered No. 20 and the other numbered No. 20 should be numbered No. 21.

I am asking your permission that the Resolution for \$44,667 and the other Resolution for \$25,100 should be numbered No. 20 and No. 21 respectively.

There is urgent reason for doing it now. The Other Place is about to meet to deal with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that the hon. junior member for the City will not object if this matter is dealt with now, because the Other Place is about to meet. If there is no objection, leave is granted to deal with them now.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have accordingly amended and initialed these two Resolutions No. 19 as No. 20, and No. 20 as No. 21. I am grateful that the hon. junior member for the City in order to facilitate the business of the Other Chamber has given way so as to proceed with this matter at once.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I want to place on record how very pleased I am personally that Government is about to acquire a place for the carrying on of the Commissioner's service in Montreal. This has my pleasure in that I am responsible for sending more people to Canada than any other individual. I am particularly glad about this and I would like also to place on record my appreciation of the work done by the Students Liaison Service - work not known

perhaps to the members of the general public but work which has been highly praised by students in Canada who sometimes find themselves in conflict with the Immigration authorities. I am glad that this work will now be continued.

I would also like to have negotiations initiated, now that Trinidad has become a nation in its own right, instead of students from Barbados wanting to emigrate to Canada having to write to the Canadian Trade Commissioner in Trinidad, that that service be transferred to Bridgetown and not placed in one of the other Islands with whom this *marriage de convenance* is discussed because there are some of us who think this proposed Federation is not likely to last if it comes into being. It is unusual for a firm which is financially successful if it intends to branch out, to look around for a bankrupt firm as a partner and that is what this Government is trying to do. Only this morning before I came in here, a businessman who has Colonial connections told me that two of these Governments whose accounts he had dealings with, he had to write off.

1.55 p.m.

Be that as it may, what I would like to ask in respect of the office of the Canadian Trade Commissioner, is that the Government take steps to see that this office be transferred to Bridgetown because there are very many Barbadian students and others who are willing and anxious to emigrate to Canada and it would be a great boon to them if that office were located in this island. Very many of them could pass the test because Canada has now changed its policy, and any applicant who is likely to be an asset to the new community to which he is going has a fair chance of acceptance.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to deal very briefly with the questions which have been raised - at least the sensible ones - by the members opposite. There is an Addendum to the Resolution, and if hon. members would read that Addendum they would find many things explained there in answer to the questions which have been asked. I do not want to be disparaging in anyway, but as far as rental is concerned.....

At this stage, it now being 2 p.m. of the clock,

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

This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that you have the Bell rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Premier for drawing that to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Are there any Replies ready to Questions which have been asked?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 41/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on the 16th March, 1962, and the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 71/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph are all ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 41/1962 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew; I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

Question No. 71 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Again, the hon. member is not now in his place.

I recall that last week replies were laid to Question No. 47 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Again I observe that the hon. member is not in

his place. Are there any other answers to questions ready? Otherwise we will revert to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George:- To move the third reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of certain lands at St. George's Rectory. That Bill, I observe, has been referred to a Select Committee.

Orders Nos. 2 to 13 inclusive were called, but the hon. members in whose names the Orders stood were not in their places.

RESOLUTION re LAYING OF MAIN AT THORPE'S COTTAGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 14 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George:- To move the passing of a Resolution relative to the laying of a main at Thorpe's Cottage in the parish of St. George. Is the hon. member ready to proceed with this Order?

Mr. LOWE: Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I am asking the Government to give priority to the laying of a main at Thorpe's Cottage in the parish of St. George. Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Government give priority and take immediate steps to place a 4" main in Thorpe's Cottage, St. George, whereby the residents of that district will be able to obtain water supply".

I am asking the Government to give priority to the laying of such a main whereby the residents within the Thorpe's Cottage area will obtain their water supply. When you realise that in this day approximately about thirty residents are living off the proper highway, surrounded by canes in some instances, and in the case of fire, when we realise the conditions whereby these people are unable to obtain telephonic communications, I feel that, taking all these things into consideration, the Government should see fit to carry out the terms of this particular Resolution and make the laying of this main at Thorpe's Cottage a priority. 2.35 p.m.

When you realise that water is an essential commodity for cleanliness and that children within the area have to travel at least a quarter of a mile to obtain water, I feel this is one Resolution which no hon. member should speak against, but support in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate further on this Resolution. The needs of the people are first and that is why I am asking this Government to give priority to this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the passing of this Resolution. In doing so I agree with all that the previous hon. member has said.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the laying of a water main at Thorpe's Cottage, St. George is included in the programme of works for the current financial year and work will commence on it very shortly.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, having had the confirmation from the Minister that this main will shortly be laid, I now ask leave that this Resolution be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George has asked leave to withdraw this Resolution standing in his name. I take it that the hon. seconder of the Resolution supports that application for leave. Is there any objection? Apparently there is none, and leave is granted. Accordingly the Resolution is withdrawn.

We now proceed to Order No. 15 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the Leader of the Opposition, to move the third reading of a Bill to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. Michael to sell certain lands to the Trustees of Kensington Cricket Grounds.

THE ST. MARY'S CHAPEL (CURATE'S RESIDENCE ACT, 1962.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as you will realise, the Committee appointed to consider this Bill came to a unanimous decision. Everything has passed the Government's eye and has been approved, and there is no need to say anything more to what I said on the second reading.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: We will proceed to Order No. 16 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George, whose absence I observe. A similar remark applies to the hon. junior member for St. John whose item is No. 17, to Order No. 18 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, to Order No. 19 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and to Order No. 20 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Order No. 21 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who is in his place.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that I was dealing with that particular item. This however cannot be proceeded with yet as we have not had the Select Committee's Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 22 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who is not in his place, and Order No. 23 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who is yet in his place. This Order is to move the passing of a Resolution relative to the amendment of the Barbados Scholarship Act, 1890.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall be ready to deal with this Order until the Hon. Minister of Education is in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand that the hon. member is asking that he be allowed not to proceed with this matter today?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave not to proceed with it today.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It would seem that Private Members' Business has been exhausted, and automatically we revert to Government Business. When we were last dealing with Government Business, the Hon. and Learned Premier had risen to reply to speeches made by hon. members on the Resolution to authorise the Executive Committee to execute certain leases and so on. Will the Hon. and Learned Premier now proceed?

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION re LEASES OF PROPERTIES IN LONDON AND MONTREAL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City asked certain questions to the feasibility of acquiring premises particularly in London on a freehold rather than leasehold basis, May I say at the outset

that it was our original intention to acquire premises on a freehold basis if such premises could be found in the appropriate area. I have in front of me a list of premises which the Chief Minister of St. Kitts and I visited, and on this particular list not one of these premises available — and there are some eleven of them — was available for sale on a leasehold basis. The system of land tenure in the metropolitan area of London is somewhat different from the prevailing system in Barbados. A leasehold tenure is virtually unknown in this Island although it is due to the acquisition of Crown lands at a time of the ceding of certain territories.

2.45 p.m.

It is well known to be an established system of conveyance in neighbouring territories like Trinidad and the Windward Islands. They were on another list which I had at one time, which was also investigated by a delegation to London. There were one or two premises which could be obtained on a freehold basis, but those premises had to be turned down on the grounds of the very high prices which were asked for them, their general unsuitability or due to the fact that the area had been under development, something similar to our Town and Country Planning but much more comprehensive in scope of operation. I think that is the reply to the hon. senior member for the City on that point.

The other question which the hon. senior member for the City raised was as regards the nature of accommodation in Montreal. The accommodation of the premises in Montreal which we are supposed to lease is approximately 1,000 square feet on the first floor of a building of a relatively recent construction. It comprises one large outer office and a waiting room and, as far as I remember, two inner offices. All three of those offices are sited in a wing of the building with proper ventilation, with natural lighting on two sides and it is felt that an office of that size would be adequate for the purposes which we intend.

There is no possibility at all of acquiring property in London on a freehold basis, but I consider what we have to pay is a reasonable rent, certainly for premises in that business centre of London.

I think at this stage it would be appropriate to deal with the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I regret that he is not in his place at the moment, but I would like to put this on record. He said that when this Government was in the Opposition we criticised the purchase of premises in London for the Migrant Liaison Officer and with the usual appeal to sentiment he said that the officer was doing fine work in London. I do not want to go into the merits or demerits of the officer because obviously we do not want to say things which would damage Civil Servants but the position of the London premises was this. There was an office, known as the High Commissioner's office, and there was a High Commissioner, First and Second Secretary and a large staff numbering in all between 70 and 80 persons. The High Commissioner in London did not have a house bought by the West Indian Government, nor no member of the staff in London had a house purchased for him.

I am very glad the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has returned to his seat. The Jamaican Government also had a Migrants Liaison Service catering to over 18,000 Jamaicans in London. The head of that Service was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Ivan DeSousa. The Jamaican Migrants Service itself, speaking from memory, must have had a staff of 30 or 40 officers alone. The Barbados Migrants Service had an entire staff of six. The situation in London was that there was a staff of 80 in the High Commissioner's Office and a staff of over 30 in the Jamaican Migrants Section. Out of those 120 officers, the Barbados Government was the only Government which elected to buy premises for its Migrants Liaison Officer.

Now, let us examine the situation right here in Barbados. The Labour Commissioner who is the head of that Department does not have a house provided for him by the Government. There is no Minister here who lives in Government quarters in contradistinction to Ministers in other

neighbouring colonies. There is no Minister here who has a house provided for him or has the concession of living in a Government house on payment of a certain amount of his salary for rent. Now, you had a representative in London who was getting a house allowance of £400 per annum, who was also in receipt of representative allowance — and not only a representative allowance but a special entertainment allowance also. All that was given to him besides his salary. When you add the salary of the Migrants Officer to all those allowances, you found that the officer drew a total amount which was higher than the salary given to the Premier of Barbados. On top of that, you singled out one member of the Civil Service to buy a house for and you bought it in an area where he could not be available to the migrants or students. Of course, when the last Government brought in the Resolution for it, they said that they were purchasing a house for this officer because the employers in England used to entertain him, and so it was necessary for him to entertain them likewise; so you went and purchased a house for him in a place where the employers lived. That is the position. That is not a figment of my imagination.

We opposed the purchase of those premises on several good and sufficient reasons. I do not want to go too much into this question now because what this Government discovered was that the premises were purchased after the last General Elections, and we have been writing to the Crown Agents for the Colonies almost every week for the last nine months trying to find out the date when it was purchased and up to now they have given us fifteen different answers but they have not given us an idea of the date. They have given us statements like, "early in December", and so on. We have been made to understand that the agreement was signed eight days after we came into office.

I regret that I have to answer the hon. member's question because it would look as if I am attacking the individual officer. Let us examine the situation frankly. We purchased the house for \$73,000 including \$10,000 for furniture. What we paid for furniture was almost as much as the cost of a house which any of us would buy here for ourselves except members of the Barbados National Party.

2.55 p.m.

The hon. member said that we must be businesslike and that we criticised the purchase of this house; but there are 120,000 West Indians that we are leasing the present buildings at Kensington High Street to provide services for. That is nothing to do with the 5,000 or 6,000 students in and around the metropolitan area of London making a total of 125,000. The hon. member is objecting therefore to the leasing of premises for the benefit of 125,000 people.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the leasing of anything. Do you mean to say that the Hon. Premier cannot get up and say something which one has said ten minutes ago without trying to do the new dance, the "Twist"? I am not against the leasing of the premises; I am asking what would be the contribution to this amount from the other territories. That is what I would like to know from the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I took the trouble to write down certain statements made by the hon. member. He said that we are leasing the buildings for all of this money and yet, when I was in the Opposition, I objected to buying premises for the Immigrant Liaison Officer who has to find work for poor people.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Is that objecting to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker? Why does the Hon. Premier not try and put in something now?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are approximately 125,000 people in the Kensington High Street area — nothing to do with 30,000 Jamaicans at all. The hon. member knows that there are 25,000 Barbadians alone. As to the premises in Bruton Street, the hon. member's Party was spending \$800,000 a year; they were spending \$800,000 a year on that Headquarters alone. Our contribution was approximately 9% of that. Over and above that, despite the fact that we had a Migrants' Division at Bruton Street, we still had to

pay for a Migrants' Division down at Mill Bank on the pretext that there was some special service that the Barbados Government was affording the immigrants who, after they got up there, never saw the migrants' office. I am not using this as a criticism. The Resolution passed by the last Government was for the purchase of a house for one officer when we had the immigrants huddled eight and nine in a room, the immigrants which that officer was supposed to be looking after. I have positive proof of that. If they got four in a room they considered themselves lucky. Over and above that, the Barbados Government was lending money to people, some of them not even Barbadians, and in this house purchased by the burdened taxpayers, our people were huddled eight and nine in a room. In addition to that, one of these persons who is not a Barbadian — I do not know whose friend he is and I do not care either, but I will not call his name — was allowed to borrow money from the Government of Barbados in order to accommodate immigrants. He has never paid one penny interest or one penny on the principal amount borrowed by the said person from the Government up to now and nothing has been done to collect that money. This is a personal benefit scheme for a few chosen individuals; that is the sorry state of affairs which the Hon. Minister of Trade, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I investigated in London.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants more figures, I will give him more figures. Is he equating a house for \$73,000 including \$10,000 for furniture alone for one officer who was working for £400 a year before he left Barbados and who was getting four hundred pounds a year in rent allowance before the Barbados Government purchased this house and who was currently drawing more money than the Premier of the Island — no other West Indian Officer in the United Kingdom has a house of that value — is the hon. member equating that with the acquisition of Commission premises for 125,000 West Indians? The original estimate which Sir Garnet Gordon drew up for this Government was a projection of \$239,000 a year. When the Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers, the Chief Minister of St. Kitts and I went to the United Kingdom in September last year, we went through the Budget. When we first went to the Colonial Office with the figures, we had to submit all of these things for the Treasury approval; since the other territories are grant-aided, we went down to the Colonial Office and presented these figures. We have a figure of \$40,000 a year rent which would be within the competence of the Government, a figure above the amount for the lease of these premises which is £8,000 or \$38,000 approximately. We were told that this amount of \$40,000 a year was a bit too optimistic and that it should be increased to \$50,000 a year; that was done at Church House on the advice of the financial experts. The Treasury has said that \$38,000 should be enough. Long before we saw these premises and knew what we had to pay, they said that they would put down \$50,000 per annum which would be more realistic. We reduced Sir Garnet Gordon's budget of \$239,000 to something like \$114,000 and that was our fault. Mr. Southwell and I had slashed down certain things and effected certain economies; we left out the Migrants' Service which cost over \$40,000 a year in order to reduce the figures to \$114,000, and because of that the British Treasury felt that we should economise by certain other things. If we were to equate the Barbados Migrant Service, it would send the figure up to approximately \$150,000 as we intend to do ultimately. If we do not integrate the Migrants' Service we still have to make our contribution by way of a mandatory levy towards the Federal Services.

3.05 p.m.

Now let me get the position clear. We are signing the lease for the premises, but the budget is being drawn up for the Eastern Caribbean and on the basis of a mandatory levy which is worked out. The hon. member cannot tell us anything about business. It takes people who are successful in business to come and ask questions of this kind. To tell us about being businesslike, you have to set an example first. I would take that from the hon. senior member for the City or the hon. senior member for St. Joseph or somebody who is successful in business. For him to accuse the Government of this Island, and Mr. Southwell, perhaps one of the most brilliant politicians in the West Indies, as being

unbusinesslike, if we started to quote figures and percentages for the hon. member, I am sure he would get a brain-storm; but we do not think this exercise is really something we should bother him with, because we do not want to see him come to a premature end through brain fever. Do not think we go and spend time in London and do not go into the last detail.

When the Federal Government was established, there was a mandatory levy worked out on a population income basis. There is at the present moment a formula by which the territories contribute also on a population national income basis; therefore let us take some of these figures. If the total cost of running the Commission Service in London is \$100,000 and Barbados pays fifty percent of the mandatory levy, you do not take out rent or one particular officer's salary and say Barbados pays that or so much part of that. You take the complete budget and tell the Government of Barbados that its proportion of the total budget is 50%, and therefore we are expected to pay \$50,000 which is half of the \$100,000 which is the total expenditure. I have already said that the budget for the London offices is going to be \$14,000 until we merge the Migrants Liaison Service when it will rise to about \$150,000 or \$160,000 per annum. We have to duplicate all these services. It does not mean that because Jamaica and Trinidad have gone out, we are only going to pay 8% now of the total cost of running the Commission Service. Our mandatory levy, I believe, was about 8.9%. One of the tragedies of the breakup of the West Indian nation is that each one of these Governments, whether you regard them as a group or not, now has to pay the full cost of maintaining certain services, so that the Trinidad Government has to have an Ambassador to the United Nations, and so does the Jamaican Government, in Mr. Shearer and Mr. Richardson. They each have to have an Ambassador in Washington, a High Commissioner in London and a High Commissioner in Ottawa, and they are now finding that there are other places and other sectors in which they have to have Commission Services of their own, whereas before all the territories were contributing on a mandatory levy basis to the Common Services run by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Caribbean constitute a third entity, and I think it is remarkable that we are going to run substantially the same kind of service in London that cost the Federal Government \$600,000 for a total cost of \$114,000, because by rights it should cost us in the vicinity of between \$400,000 and \$500,000, even if we abolished some of the top ranking posts. These are really the realities of the situation. Sir Garnet Gordon cannot possibly see how we can run anything of an adequate representation in London for less than \$239,000, but we have got it down to \$114,000, and the hon. member is telling me about being unbusinesslike.

Mr. Speaker, I have a vested interest which the hon. member may not have. He says he has a J.P., but I have a vested financial interest in seeing that the taxpayers' money in this country is not squandered, because I do not enjoy the privileges and immunities that the Barbados Migrants Liaison Officer in England enjoys. I have to pay taxes and I do not get any house provided for me, and therefore every time money is spent and I am going on a mission to London or anywhere else, I am thinking of how it is going to reflect in my personal income tax. I have an entirely selfish motive in seeing that expenditure is kept to a minimum. For anyone to get up and suggest that we are making the same mistakes as the former Federal Government when they were spending \$600,000 for doing something which we are attempting to do in far more commodious premises for \$114,000 is really stretching one's imagination a bit. Quite apart from that, Sir, the hon. member asked how much each territory was going to pay. The total cost of the premises is going to be paid by contributions made by each territory on the basis of a mandatory levy. I cannot emphasise that too much. The actual percentages I cannot give the hon. member now, but I have given the member an indication of how it is worked out. The amount of money which we used to contribute to the Federal Government was between \$800,000 and \$900,000 per annum. I never heard the hon. member challenge the necessity for having an

Army stationed in Jamaica unless they were going to repel an invasion from the Bay of Pigs. I never heard anybody challenge the fact that a car had to be bought for a high Federal official, but it is in the Federal assets, and the Minister of Communications can tell you the list of Federal assets of which we had to dispose. That is the kind of thing that was going on. That one Minister lived in a house that cost \$150,000 W.I.; that is the kind of nonsense that existed, and no wonder the Federation broke up at all. Another Minister — or maybe the same Minister — used to empty 25,000 gallons of water every night out of the swimming pool and fill it back next morning until the residents of Maraval and the surrounding districts had to complain to the Trinidad Government about it. You have never heard the hon. member challenge any of these things, but for the 125,000 West Indians we have in London, he is telling the Government that they are being unbusinesslike because we are leasing premises where we can provide banking facilities, have an office for the Tourist Board, have an office for the Liaison Service houses in decent premises for the first time as distinct from domestic premises, and have all the other offices which it is customary to establish and do all these things within a budget of \$150,000.

3.15 p.m.

I think it is a remarkable feat, I want to go further now. I say that if the Barbados Government in order to look after our people, our businessmen, our students, has to pay for all of this without getting any contributions from anybody, I consider it would be a worthwhile exercise on our part because I do not intend to see our people neglected. The cost to the Governments of the West Indies of the migrants in London is \$1.00 per person per year. It costs this Government here in Barbados \$95 per year per head of population. I am sure each migrant in the United Kingdom sends back home more than \$1.00 a week, probably it is more like \$1.00 a day. You must not forget the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of England whereby people are now being deported at the rate of 25 a week and some are deported before their friends and relatives know that they are sent back. If we had all those people here, we would be spending \$95 a year on each one of them. In England they send back remittances and it costs us \$1,000 a person per annum. I am giving the hon. junior member for St. Joseph some figures to think on, some simple calculation in mental arithmetic.

As far as the leasing of the premises is concerned, the hon. member says that he does not think that they are going to get anybody to sublet premises from them. Obviously, he does not know Kensington Place. It is such a popular district that the present tenants on the top floor — and there are four floors — who paid £2,000 a year have indicated to us that they are willing to carry on with the paying of their rents for that part of the premises. They have not moved out of the premises and that is the amount for the top floor alone. Then, there is the Barbados Government Bank and the Barbados Tourist Board which have to pay a similar rent of £3,000 a year for premises. The premises which the Tourist Board occupies is a concerted news building which probably covers an area of not more than Your Honour's *sanctum sanctorum*. As I have said, Barbados is paying £3,000 per annum for that space now. We will be moving the Tourist Board to our place on Kensington Street which is a popular business district in London. As I have said, there is also accommodation there for the Bank.

On the basement, there is a fully equipped cafeteria and restaurant. I do not mean it is run as a restaurant, but it has all the facilities such as cold storage, hot plate, gas stoves and so on. It is fully equipped in every sense of the word in the basement. There is also a large room about three-quarters of the size of this Legislature which would be suitable for holding meetings.

I have here 28 pages of the inventory of the furniture and other items which include Gestetner duplicating machines, dictating machines, a modern fully equipped 52-line telephone exchange and two complete heating and ventilating systems.

In our acquiring this building, I can say that we are very fortunate. If I say that we are negotiating, even though

we have been advised that the price is not fantastic, we still like to get views as to the last possible price. We are having surveys done by the Crown Agents for the Colonies and by the British Treasury. We could not hope to satisfy ourselves that we were getting a good bargain and the lease would be signed, but we have been put in the position that if they are given the authority the lease would be signed on our behalf and that is why we have brought this Resolution today.

I do not think there is any other question which I am called on to answer.

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

THE MORTGAGE INSURANCE BILL, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is also in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: Second reading of a Bill to empower the Housing Authority to issue insurance policies in respect of loans secured by mortgages of dwelling houses and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intitled an Act to empower the Housing Authority to issue insurance policies in respect of loans secured by mortgages of dwelling houses and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, is cited as the Mortgage Insurance Act, 1962.

This, Sir, is an innovation in this Island. It is a system of financing housing development which has sprung up in the Caribbean area within the last ten years.

3.25 p.m.

It was recently debated by the neighbouring territory of Trinidad and there are extensive housing developments in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico financed under the aegis, I may say, of legislation of this nature. Similarly from 1957 — 1957 until the present day, there has been a tremendous expansion in housing development in the independent territory of Jamaica. I remember well some three or four years ago going to Jamaica and seeing one scheme in which there were 720 houses which had not been there six or eight months before, and another sector called 'Harbour View' with 2,100 houses and I believe there are other schemes going on in Jamaica. The most recent development is in the Diamond Valley Project in the Trego Mountain district.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to bother hon. members with the details of the Bill. The "Objects and Reasons" set out that the Bill seeks to confer on the Housing Authority the power to insure loans secured by mortgages of dwelling houses and to set out the circumstances in which and the conditions subject to which such loans may be insured. A loan is insurable under the Bill if it was made by an approved lender to a borrower in order that the borrower may purchase or erect a house conforming to standards of construction approved by or acceptable to the Authority; and it was for the aggregate of 90% of the first \$12,000 of the appraised value or any part thereof. That means that the borrower will only have to find 10% of the money. Then you have 80% of the next \$8,000 of the appraised value or any part thereof; so that a person who is buying a house for \$20,000 would have to find 10% which is \$1,200 and 20% of the next \$8,000 which is \$1,600 making a total of \$2,800, which is under £600. That is the amount which a person wishing to purchase a house has to find. It is almost impossible in middle income housing even under the protection of our Civil Servants Housing Loans and other schemes, for a person who has not already acquired a piece of land and holds that land freehold, to go into the construction of a house unless he has 30% of the money plus the freehold land. As you know, Sir, the Civil Servants Housing Board will loan to a Civil Servant — I am using this as an illustration rather than a precept — approximately three years' salary. That will repay the loan over a period of time; but it is essential for a person who is borrowing money under one of these schemes which existed before or through the financial institutions of Barbados which are found in Solicitors' Offices apparently — they are the Wall Street, the Stock Mar-

ket and the insurance market of the island because we have no separate institutions with identity of their own. However, Sir, as I was saying, in order to build a house, the average person in the middle income bracket will have to be considered as a man who is working for more than the qualification of a General Worker's Housing Loan which is about \$200 a month. A man who is working for that amount will have to pay about £500 for 1,000 square feet of land. If he is going to build a house for \$15,000, it will be necessary for him to have another \$6,000 or \$7,000 because he could not dream to build a house otherwise. I am sure that hon. members who have experience in this country know that although there is no established law, yet there is the time-honoured practice both with lumber yards and merchants where you will have a situation in which you will find that unless a person had an amount which would be \$2,400 plus \$6,000 or \$7,000, he could not even get the foundation of the house. A person who wishes to build a house for \$15,000 would have to look for about \$5,000 or \$6,000; however, under this scheme, a person who wants to build a house for \$20,000 will have to look for \$2,800 and then he will have to make monthly payments which will amortize the balance of the loan, insure his life, insure the house and pay interest and pay his water rates. If you are buying a house for \$20,000 under this scheme, you find \$2,800 and anybody who is sufficiently thrifty should be in a position to get somewhere.

A lot of people who do not own houses own motor cars which cost \$4,000. If a man wants to have a house for his children, he will make a sacrifice somewhere and get \$2,800 accumulated in his hand. We want to encourage thrift. A man who is not going to make a contribution himself should be a house renter and not a house owner. I think that the man who wants the Government to provide him with everything is not ready for the responsibility either of ownership or of citizenship. If you cannot afford to get \$2,800 you cannot live in a house for \$21,000. I think that this is a considerable improvement on what used to exist. The average house provided by the Housing Authority is a house which costs about \$3,800 to \$4,500 and some of them cost only \$2,600. We are now dealing, not with low income houses but with middle income houses, and we think that middle income houses go from \$7,000 and \$8,000 to \$25,000. There is a large group of persons in Barbados who can, with a certain exercise of thrift, accumulate small amounts of capital, but the present market conditions and loan conditions prevailing in Barbados militate against that person ever owning property of his own. If we can ease pressure off those persons who are inflating the prices of houses but are really in low income rented houses, people who are paying rents up to \$50 a month and \$60 a month for houses which are only worth \$20 a month - if we can ease the pressure off these houses we will have more houses available for lower in comes.

3.35 p.m.

I am trying to explain the provisions of this Bill in very simple terms. If a man then wants to build a house for \$24,000, he will have to find something like \$4,200, because he is only allowed 70% of the next \$4,000. How the scheme will operate therefore is that Government will be interested in this in more ways than one. In the first instance Government proposes to rehouse 25,000 people over the next ten years in Barbados in many housing projects of this kind which will be no burden on the community. This has nothing at all to do with other building schemes, and for this purpose, the Government has made surveys. The Ministers and I, the members of the Town Planning Authority and of the Public Works and so on have made extensive hikes, I will call them, or safaris looking at the land and so on, and there are approximately 1,100 acres of land available. We can build to a density of about six or seven houses to the acre, because we have to make allowances for road, parks, playing fields, schools, churches and so on. We are building a new concept of community life in the Island and at the same time fostering the spirit of self-reliance on the people themselves by giving them a sense of ownership and a sense of property.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe too much in the extension of the system whereby the Government holds all the

property in Barbados and has no income coming in from it. We believe that people should be brought alive to their responsibilities as citizens and should have a sense of pride in owning properties of their own. As far as I am concerned, I feel that an over-emphasis on housing owned by Government without any opportunity for the people to acquire these properties themselves as we declared in our Manifesto - is only extending the almshouse system and making a system of outdoor relief rather than indoor relief. That is what it would amount to; but in order to encourage the spirit of self-reliance, we have what Professor Richardson said in his Report in 1954, that you should give people a sense of ownership and a sense of property, and then they feel they have a contribution in the community both by way of taxes and otherwise.

There are things which will not be patent on the face of this Bill about mortgage insurance housing which I would like to explain to members. If you got a man therefore who is not a Civil Servant, this scheme is open as much to him as to anybody else. This scheme is open to everybody, and we hope that Civil Servants and other people in business and in industry and commerce will make use of it. A breadwinner in a family may have cashed in an insurance policy which he had for fifteen or twenty years and received \$3,000 and decides he wants a house. The only kind of house you can get in Barbados for \$3,000 is a 16' x 9' with shed roof and kitchen; so let us face facts. After we introduce this scheme, that same man with \$3,000 can go to the Housing Authority and say he wants to have a house built for him under the Mortgage Insurance Scheme, and he pays down \$2,800 keeping \$200 in his pocket to help him with insurance and solicitors' fees and so on. That is another matter with which I intend to deal, because I think when we have a scheme of this kind we cannot suffer the long delays and the high prices that people have to pay for conveyances in this Island, because if we build, say, 7,000 houses there will be no dispute about the title of that land.

Mr. Speaker, I have had several discussions with business associates and legal people in New York and London about a way of simplifying the art of conveyance in Barbados so that people do not have to pay these very high charges they have to meet when they want to purchase or sell property. But I was just dilating on that because I thought I might mention it *en passant*, as it were.

If we go back to the situation of a man who probably owns a chattel house which is worth \$3,000, he can sell that house and decide he wants a house for \$20,000 which will include the price of the land. He goes and pays in \$2,800 and signs up the necessary agreements, then his life automatically becomes insured for \$20,000, the house becomes insured for its insurable value, whatever that may be, it may be \$17,000 or \$18,000, and after that, he has only got to satisfy the Authority that he is in receipt of an income from which he will be able to meet the commitments from month to month. He may have to pay, say, \$60 a month, but the \$60 will pay his insurance premiums, both his fire insurance and life insurance, pay the interest on his money, and a certain amount will be set aside for the amortization of the loan, so that in twenty years' time, he becomes the absolute owner of this house.

The beauty of the scheme is that if a man has a wife and four or five children, he is only paying in \$2,800 on the house, and if he should unfortunately die, say, a month after he moved into his house, the house automatically becomes his wife's without any further payment because his life has been insured for an amount to cover the cost and the wife probably gets some money in her hands, because if he has paid in about \$3,000 and his life is insured for \$20,000, his life insurance policy pays off for the house and puts \$3,000 in the hands of his wife at the same time. That is why we call it Mortgage rental insurance housing. This is one of the great social measures of the post-war era, and I think it is going to transform the system of property ownership in this Island; it is going to transfigure the face of the countryside, and I am sure that the standard of housing in Barbados will improve; and a lot of people now who cannot afford to build houses for themselves or to acquire land, once they know that there is a target that they can strive

after and that once they achieve that target the scheme under Government Mortgage Insurance Legislation will look after the rest for them, I am sure that we are going to find that the ranks of house owners will be smaller immeasurably.

You will not, as I said, Sir, find all of the things that I have mentioned in this Bill. The point is that we do not need legislative authority for the other aspects of mortgage insurance housing that I have outlined, but the purpose of the Bill is to authorise the Housing Authority, which will be the competent authority on mortgage insurance housing, to insure loans secured against the mortgages of dwelling houses. The loans themselves will be insured, and you will find in section 13 that the Housing Authority may, out of moneys provided by the Legislature, from time to time advance to the Authority for the purposes of this Act on such terms and conditions as to repayment or otherwise as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may determine, such amounts as will enable the Authority to discharge its functions under this Act. In other words, the Government is guaranteeing the credit of the Housing Authority. We are embarking on schemes of housing which both quantitatively and qualitatively far transcends anything that has taken place in this Island, before, and the change in the personnel of that Authority is not without its significance vis-a-vis the provisions of this Bill. That is all I want to say on it. The Government has been experiencing some difficulty in getting even a comprehension on the part of Statutory Boards of what the Government's policy is.

3.45 p.m.

When therefore we have a seemingly complicated system like this to operate which is, from the point of view of housing practice and housing theory, a departure - although a considerable research was done on the project on the instance of the C. D. C. - we have now to implement the schemes and therefore, we will have nothing standing in our way to prevent us carrying out schemes of this kind.

The other statement which I think I can disclose is that the C. D. C. would be subscribing in the vicinity of £1 million immediately towards the implementation of this scheme. It is for Government to acquire this land and one of the reasons for my hurrying through the Development Charges Bill was that we could not invest in 1,000 acres of land and put in the necessary facilities unless Government was sure it would be compensated for the outlay which we are going in for. I have done my best as briefly as I could to explain to hon. members not only what the provisions of the Bill are but why we have brought in the Bill.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill definitely revolutionises the building of houses in Barbados and I am pleased to hear the Hon. Premier say agreeing with a similar sentiment of mine that he would like to see as many Barbadians as possible owning their homes. With that, we on this side are in firm agreement. We Barbadians have a higher comparison of house ownership in all categories of society than in other West Indian Islands and that makes the stability of Barbados outstanding in the Caribbean. To further that by a Bill such as this to acquire an easy opportunity for acquiring houses, we welcome it on this side.

The Premier has explained the method of financing, but he did not indicate what he thought would be the interest rates on such mortgages. However, in his reply he can give some indication, because the lower the interest rate can be, the greater would be the encouragement. If Government had to subsidise a feature of this, we welcome that too because we are so small on the house ownership extension that even if we had to subsidise it to a point, we welcome that.

There is a second thing which I had hoped the Hon. Premier would give us a little enlightenment on. It is as regards Section 16 which deals with the easing of income tax on loans for the purpose. It is by approved persons or bodies. The income tax rates in Barbados on companies is

now 40%, and anyone dealing with the lending of money is also subjected to that 40%. That is here. To encourage outside capital to come in, this Bill seeks to reduce that to 12 1/2%.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give away, may I explain that now to the hon. member. The Bill makes a specified provision for building your home. We are getting first funds for the building scheme which we want to get moving right away, but the Government is preparing general legislation for reducing that tax to 12 1/2%.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Hon. Premier for the explanation. I know it would cause capital to flow into Barbados. I know of instances of development going on in the Tourist Industry where people are just waiting for such legislation to be finalised. That is only one phase.

This is a step in the right direction. We are not embarking on something new; it is tried in other territories of the West Indies and has proved successful, and because of that Trinidad is going ahead and building houses by the acre. That can be done in Barbados and for that reason we welcome this Bill wholeheartedly.

I am pleased to know that further legislation will be coming down as regards reducing the income tax on such capital loans. It is no use setting up a structure if the inducement is not here. We all know that capital is in short supply; therefore, we have to give inducement for capital to come as we give inducement to other industries to come in. We agree and support this Bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has my support. I am acquainted with the matter because I had a good deal to do with it. I have listened to the Hon. Premier carefully and I can tell him that when my Party was running the Government we had serious discussions with members of building societies over the matter.

3.55 p.m.

This scheme does not go down to the lower sections of the middle classes and obviously there is a constant thought of 20 or 30 years. A period of 20 or 30 years is the best period of a man's life. As to the question of ownership, there may be the outlay of a considerable sum which may be \$20,000 to be spread over a period of 20 or 30 years. However, I just want to signify my intention of supporting this Bill and I think it is only a question of the availability of funds and priority when it comes to Government. The question of £1 million for development over a period is something which we have to consider very carefully, and I have no doubt that the Government has given that matter their careful consideration. A scheme like this we are bound to support.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is another aspect of the matter that some of our Local Government Councillors and Aldermen in this Chamber may be interested in; that is, on the 22nd March, this year, the Government agreed to a request by Local Government Councillors that the existing legislation be amended in order that the Local Government employees may be eligible for housing loans in any proposed scheme of mortgage insurance. I say that so that the Local Government employees who have been complaining that they have not been allowed to participate in the Civil Servants' Housing Scheme will also be able to take advantage of this scheme. I said earlier that the Colonial Development Corporation will be putting up £1 million; that might be slightly misleading. The position is that the Colonial Development Corporation along with another concern will be putting \$9,600,000 and it will be putting that to assist in housing development immediately; but the contribution from the Colonial Development Corporation will be £1 million and the other concern will be paying up an additional amount. The hon. junior member for St. George will appreciate that that had been canvassed sometime last year, but no finality was made. It is not £1 million, but £2 million which is invested in this scheme.

Mr. MILLER: As I understand it, there will not be a loan of £1 million by the Colonial Development Corporation; this is a society or building organisation of its own. I take it that somebody will operate in this form of society. We

were more or less working on this matter and it looks as if it was over a year ago. I would like to know if this is a separate organisation; are you thinking in terms of separate building societies or two companies forming a building society separate and apart from the Government?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say anything about building societies at all. This is a financial investment, and this approach to building society legislation is something into which we are looking now. Any such scheme is entirely separate and distinct from this one. The Colonial Development Corporation had communicated to the last Government that they would be willing to back up a scheme like this; but they will have a part in the business. I forgot to mention that between the Colonial Development Corporation and the company — I do not know how far they have signed up with the investment company to carry out the scheme — but the total which will be carrying out the construction of these houses will be £2 million. The Government will be buying the land; the Government will be guaranteeing the loans from the Housing Authority, and we will have a direct hand in making new house ownership available to the people of this island by buying the land and providing the loans. There is a sociological and planning aspect of it as well, and with these two aspects the Government is primarily concerned. We will not be coming to the Legislature other than for money for the purchase of the land which is something like 1,1000 acres, and the money which we hope to get back for paying the cost of developing the area. That is why we brought before the House a Bill dealing with development charges first so that the scheme will be started. By the development charges we hope to repay ourselves for the water and the roads.

As to the employment aspects of the matter, we will probably have the first sewerage system in the island on the new area which we will develop on the North Eastern side of Bridgetown. The Colonial Development Corporation and a private firm are putting up £1 million in partnership, but not as a building society.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker,....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member will have to make his contribution when we go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

4.05 p.m.

Clauses 5 to 15 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 16 was called. It reads as follows:—

16. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections four and ten of the Income Tax Act, 1921, an approved lender shall be liable to income tax at the rate of twelve and one half cents on every dollar of income which is chargeable with income tax being income arising from profits and gains derived from interest of money, fees, commissions and other profits and gains in respect of loans approved under this Act.

(2) Where an approved lender is a company,

(a) such company shall place in a separate account all profits and gains specified in subsection (1) of this section and if it intends to pay a dividend to its

shareholders out of such profits and gains, such dividend shall be paid out of such account;

(b) any shareholder of such company who is not resident in the Island and to whom a dividend is paid out of the profits and gains specified in subsection (1) of this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section four and ten of the Income Tax 1921, be liable to income tax at the rate of twelve and one half cents on every dollar of such dividend.

(3) For the purposes of this section the expressions "company" and "shareholder" have the meanings respectively assigned to them in section two of the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 16 stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this is the section which I mentioned was the most vital part of this Bill to provide the necessary funds for the carrying out of this project. The Premier said that there was further legislation to follow, and the only question I would like to ask at this stage is whether that legislation could be brought to the House before the end of the year.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it will be brought to the House within the next two weeks, I should say. How long the House takes to deal with it is beyond my control; but as far as I remember, it should be ready for next week but certainly within the next two weeks.

Mr. GODDARD: I am very pleased to hear that, because as I mentioned before, this is of very great importance to the development of Barbados. It is legislation that is absolutely necessary because we are appealing to the outside world for these funds, and I am very glad to know that legislation will be before the House so shortly.

The question that Clause 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 17 was called and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to recommit Section 4 in order to correct a slight typographical error in line 1 of subsection (f).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to recommit Section 4, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in line 1 of subsection (f) of Section 4, the word "of" should be deleted because there is another "of" at the beginning of the second line.

I beg to move that this section as amended do now pass.

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

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

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

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

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. In connection with this Order, I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House was to have a word with the Leader of the Opposition and the

Leader of the Minority Party Opposition to consider resumption of the debate on this Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference of 1962, I have not been advised by the Hon. Leader of the House of the result of the consultation with the Hon. Leaders of the other Parties.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to take Order No. 5 which stands in his name as the next Order of the Day, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. I hear no objection. Leave to proceed is granted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) (No. 3)
ACT, 1962

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That motion had already been made on the 16th October by the Hon. Premier and seconded by the Hon. Leader of the House.

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

4.15 p.m.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER No. 6 POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the laws of this Island relating to pensions of Teachers in secondary schools.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find out whether this Bill has been circulated to hon. members. On the last occasion, it was not circulated and as far as I have been made to understand, it has not yet been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no copy on my file.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will have to ask leave to go on to the next item on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the Hon. Premier of certain things given notice of today which was intended to be proceeded with in all their stages.

THE TRUSTEE INVESTMENT IN BARBADOS
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES (AMEND-
MENT) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to make the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Bill the next Order of the Day.

We gave notice of this Bill today and we are now asking for leave to proceed with it as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is so important to do it today and I wonder that because I have not yet read it. If there is some special reason for dealing with it today, well then; otherwise I suggest that it should be postponed until next week.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is important.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will counsel the Hon. Premier to speak at length on it until hon. members have the opportunity of digesting it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a matter of extreme urgency. Hon. members will remember that Government disclosed that we had permission to raise £1 1/4 million on the London Market some months ago, and I have been agitating the financial authorities in London to get on with the job of preparing the necessary advertisements and other things. Quite apart from that, I made a statement shortly after my first return that the Government of Barbados had been promised a loan of £1 1/2 million and shortly after that, the Government of Trinidad and the Government of Jamaica also managed to secure similar undertakings from the British Government for a similar amount. Only one of the three territories up to now has been vouchsafed the benefit of that loan, but I think the changeover to the state of independence of the other two territories would mean some amendment to the legislation governing Government Securities. However, current events cast their shadow before them because the British Treasury and the financial authorities in London now think that we amend our Act of 1902 to bring us in line with the laws of the other Commonwealth territories.

It is our considered opinion that the Act may not be necessary today, but the points in relation to the people who are responsible for raising the money. It is predicated — although they have not actually spelt it, but by virtue of the amendment they are predicating — that Barbados is very shortly to become an independent colony within the British Commonwealth of nations; therefore, they are asking us — although they have not given us the reason, but reading between the lines, the reason is that we are considered soon to become an independent territory. Another construction is that before the expiration of the period of the repayment of these loans, the territory will certainly be an independent territory within or without a Federal system of Government. Therefore it is a matter of extreme urgency for us to demonstrate to the London Money Market that we will be enjoying all the privileges and immunities which independent countries enjoy, that we should make this amendment to our Act so as to re-assure potential investors that notwithstanding the appeal of any provisions in the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions whereby the Sovereign has the power of disallowance, notwithstanding that although we have a different form of image in our securities, the normal safeguards apply. The Bill does not say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has fully and with clarity elucidated the reasons why this Bill should be taken as the next Order of the Day. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier. Hearing no objection.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member, but speaking on a point of order I should just like to make an enquiry. The enquiry is this; has the Government requested the leave of the House to deal with this Bill in all of its stages today?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Peter was not in his place when that permission was sought and granted. Of course, he is quite within his rights to enquire whether the formalities and proprieties have been observed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every hon. member of this House must be ceaselessly vigilant.

TRUSTEE INVESTMENT IN BARBADOS GOVERNMENT SECURITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act further to amend the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the reason why, or one of the main reasons why, we are asking that this Bill be dealt with at this time is that we are very anxious to re-finance the Deep Water Harbour which was never really financed at all. We have been advised within the past month or so, and from our own observations it is apparent, that the conditions on the London Money Market are as favourable as they are likely to be in the near future. If we want to press on with our development programme, then it is necessary that the Deep Water Harbour be properly financed. I will go so far as to say that it was never financed at all. In the Ministry of Finance we are working on a complete review of the whole problem of financing the Deep Water Harbour, and the purpose of this Bill will be to carry out the necessary amendments whereby we will be able more easily to raise the money we need on the London Money Market. If the money is raised, that money goes into the Treasury of this island and the Harbour will then pay the appropriate charges against the contribution to the project which it was expected to bear when the scheme was instituted.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want at this stage to go into any more detailed analysis of the provisions of the Bill which seeks an enlargement of the scope of the principal Act of 1902 to such an extent as is necessary to enable that Act to apply not only to those securities in the United Kingdom to which it at present applies, but also to new securities issued in the United Kingdom to which, by the conditions of their issue, it is provided that the provisions of the principal Act shall apply. The Bill also seeks to make the following amendments to the principal Act: (a) to repeal the Preamble which relates to enactments in and under the Colonial Stock Act, 1900 that have ceased to have effect: to delete the word "Trustee" from the short title; this is necessary as the Act is designed to facilitate not only the investment of trust funds but the investment of other funds as well. It is now proposed that the Short Title should be "The Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1962". You will find that in Clause 3 of the Bill.

The amendment to Clause 6 is the amendment to which I referred in the Letters Patent — the power of disallowance to change the terms of a contract under which a person has income invested. The power of disallowance will be exercised by Her Majesty in Council. The purpose of Clause 6 is that notwithstanding that we have that provision, no matter what happens to the Constitution of Barbados through the period of subsistence of such loans and advances, the persons who invest would be safeguarded in this respect as if the power of disallowance is still there, but it will be exercised not by the mandate of the Queen in Council, but by the provisions of the law which will be entrenched in our Constitution. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, if this Bill is necessary for the borrowing of money on the London Stock Exchange for the development as proposed in the next three years for the re-financing of the Deep Water Harbour, we, on this side of the House, will support this Bill. The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill have been set out; they are somewhat of a legal nature and you cannot read this Bill once and get the implications of it. The Premier has stated pretty clearly what the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill are and why it is necessary that this Bill should be dealt with today. 4.35 p.m.

Jamaica and Trinidad and all independent countries have been asked to do the same thing, and as he said, Barbados which is looking to independence has been called on to amend our Bill so as to enable funds to be made available

more easily. I wonder when he said 'Jamaica' and 'Trinidad' if he knew whether one has also been sent to British Guiana for similar treatment. I notice in passing that there seems to be a change in the spelling of "Guiana". It used to be spelt with an "I", but it is now being spelt with a "Y". I wonder if that is the new Guiana for independence.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, in exercising that ceaseless vigilance which Your Honour so highly commended not so long ago, I am also minded to enquire about the spelling of the word "securities" in paragraph 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that that would more properly be dealt with in Committee when we arrive at that section, having duly forewarned the Leader of the House?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, no one would try to oppose a Bill of this sort, because it is a means of borrowing money to finance the country; but truly, Sir, I do not feel it is fair that the Government should throw it upon us so suddenly today, because it was their intention to borrow money ever since, and they knew about it. If it were I as a layman, I could be excused; but the Hon. Premier, a top lawyer and legal man, would know that amendments of this sort would have to come here for our approval. Even last week he could have circularised us with them so that we would get acquainted with them. This makes me believe that only because he has numbers, whatever he does is right. He cannot tell me that he did not know this was to be done, because it was his intention to borrow this money before he got the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be a personal loan.

Mr. SMITH: Really, Sir, it is not fair to us. I am not opposing it because I want to see things done, and the Premier has not done anything yet. Something should have been done long ago, but if he does not have the money, he cannot do it. I wonder if he did it so that if I opposed it he would be able to say I am responsible for progress being retarded. There is something wrong, and I cannot forgive him. He knows his stuff when it comes to law and he really has taken advantage of us today. We on this side of the Table — apart from the hon. junior member for St. Thomas because he might have known about it too as he belongs to the Party, and it may have been discussed among them long ago — did not have the privilege and time of studying this Bill. I am going to say "aye" in a very low tone because I have not even read the Bill, but I have to agree with it because I understand from the Premier that it is for a loan. I understand from the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that he has carefully read it. He is a Principal and another top man, and he has even discovered a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is for a good purpose and I am going to say "aye", but in a very low tone as I have said. However, I am appealing to the Hon. Premier not to do it anymore. I know he has his numbers and he has warned me already that his numbers can get me out of here, but he must not hurriedly try to pass things like this, because it is not fair. This Bill has been typewritten and insertions put in in ink; so two people did it, a typist and somebody along with her. Anyhow, Sir, so long as it is a good thing and for a good purpose for the people of this country, I will vote for it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think there were two questions which were asked. If I may deal with the question of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he said we could have brought it last week, but the communications — I put it that way advisedly — from the Secretary of State did not arrive, as far as I know, in any territory until last Tuesday night — that was after the House adjourned — and we had to work on this promptly, because we are the people who need the money. When the hon. member said that I knew about needing the loan before we got the Government it is quite true. I realised we would need a loan and a lot more too before we even assumed office or the election was held; but in introducing the Bill, I pointed out to hon. members that it was our opinion — and it is still our opinion — that the provisions of the constitution of Barbados adequately safeguard some of the matters to which our attention has been drawn as recently as last

Wednesday by the Secretary of State, I cannot answer the question about British Guiana asked by the hon. member; you can send things to a place, but they need not necessarily follow them, and even if some places follow them, it does not mean they are going to raise any money.

I would not like to make any predictions about the chances of British Guiana getting money in London or anywhere else, because countries of this kind seem to get assistance more readily than places like Barbados that are dying of respectability; but it is within my knowledge that the Secretary of State sent this to all Commonwealth countries concerned about raising loans on the London money market. This is what would appear to me from the communication which I received and which I could not disclose in detail. It did not specify which one would be sent to Commonwealth countries that would include places like Australia, but we are the people who are knocking on the door and our loan is the first Colonial loan coming up this year on the London money market, and I want to get to the head of the queue before anybody else, because, to use the phraseology of the hon. member, we are anxious to get a 'piece of change', and it is important that we should get it before anybody gets theirs. That is why I am trying to get through this bit of legislation.

I do not think there is anything controversial about the Bill, because we already have most of these safeguards in the constitution of Barbados at the present moment. As far as I can remember, Article XI of the Letters Patent really makes provision for most of the matters provided for in this Bill, but the point is that we are borrowing the money and they have told us that they prefer us, before we come for the loan, to hurry up and have an amendment like this drafted in the Act of 1902.

4.45 p.m.

Thus it is only those people who had trust funds who invested in Government Securities. These used to be snapped up, and there was no difficulty in 1902 in getting Trustees Securities snapped up; but today you have to spread your net a little wider and you have to get people who have risk capital and funds of that nature - private funds - to buy these bonds as well and that is another important reason why we thought the matter should be done as soon as possible.

I will only explain to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I could not introduce this Bill last Tuesday because we only received the advice on the matter last Wednesday. That is the first time it was drawn to our notice that the authorities in London thought it necessary for us to have an amendment of this nature.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were called separately and passed.

Clause 6 was called. It reads as follows:-

"Section 6 of the Principal Act is amended by substituting 'Barbados Government Securities described in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of Section 3 of this Act' for the words 'Barbados Government Securities'."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in the last line of Section 6, the very last word, "securities" has been misspelt and I would like to substitute the correct spelling of the word. With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

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

The question that Clause 6 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. BHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill as amended in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 22

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the Day is a Money Resolution of which notice was given this morning with the indication that we will be asking for leave to proceed with it at today's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking leave that it be now dealt with?

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

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

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.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, Resolved that the sum of one hundred and thirty-three thousand, one hundred and eighty-eight dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1962-63, No. 22, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

4.55 p.m.

As set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, the sum of \$133,188 is required to supplement certain items of expenditure under Head 32 of the current Estimates - Highways and Transport. The increases are necessary because no provision was made to pay wage increases which resulted from the Salaries Revision of 1961. The various amounts are set out in detail in the Schedule to the Resolution. If there are any questions which hon. members would like to ask I am prepared to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. Da. C. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire if this is a further example of a new Government Department - I refer to the spelling of the word "Treasury" in line 3 of the Resolution.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 32, I "Leave Pay for Casual Employees", I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that I have tabled a Resolution dealing with this same Item. I would like to say that the casual workers of all the Government Departments should not go on leave before they can get their pay. Sometimes they go on leave and then they get their pay when they return to work. I feel that if a man is going on leave he should have his pay before he goes on leave. Another thing which happens at the Department of Highways and Transport is that some people have to forego their leave owing to pressure of work, but after the year is out and they make an application for the leave they do not get it; they do not get either the leave or the money. I am asking the Minister to see to it that when people are going on leave they get their money before they take their leave. A man who is going on leave should not forego his leave.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: For the information of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, what he has said would

be a violation of the law. It would be such a violation if the casual worker did not receive his leave after he has worked for a certain number of days in any particular year. You cannot go back and give him double pay in the following year.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that that is a violation of the law. That is why I have brought the matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister. I want the Minister to issue a mandate to the effect that people should get their money before they go on leave. I am quite positive about what I am saying; I am not just talking for the sake of talking.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the benefit of the hon. member I will make enquiries into the matter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that a Resolution of this sort has come before us because it is something which is dealing with money for the workers. However, on the right hand side of the Schedule to the Resolution I see the heading "Explanation" but no explanatory note whatsoever has been given to explain the reason for this amount of money. The Hon. Minister has said that the various amounts are set out in detail; well, he is accustomed to the amounts being set out in detail or they may be so set out in his file, but not in this Resolution which I have in my hand. Head 32 Item 32 of Estimates deals with leave pay for casual employees, but I understand that some of the permanent employees have not got any leave yet. I want to know if this leave is only for the casual employees. Taking this Resolution as I see it, there is no provision made for the permanent employees and so the Hon. Minister may have to bring down another Resolution. If the explanatory note does not say anything - and I may say that the Minister is very late in the afternoon in bringing down a Resolution of this sort because I am wondering what the Labour Officers are doing. If this was a question of a private concern, I am sure that the Labour Officers would have been there wishing to find out why these workers have not yet received their holiday. This is not a good example to be asking for money for leave pay for these workers now when I understand that leave has been due to these workers since the month of March. I would say that the Labour Officers have not been doing their job; I understand that some of the people have complained, but I do not know if the complaints were made to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, something was going to happen between now and next week if steps had not been taken in this matter, but the fears may be allayed now since this money is forthcoming. I am sure that if my staff had not received their holiday with pay, I would have seen an officer or two running me down. No private individual could get away with this matter for so long because the newspapers would have taken up the matter. However, I must compliment the Hon. Minister for doing something in the early and not allowing to happen what was going to happen.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has enquired about Item 32, "Leave pay for casual employees" and he is wondering if permanent employees are also included in this Resolution.

5.05 p.m.

This definitely states "for casual employees", and the money could not be used for any other purpose than for casual employees. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph says that this is the month of October, and the financial year commences in April, I will explain that what has actually happened is that due to sickness over the last six weeks, a very large number of labourers took their holiday and the amount is, as will be seen in the Addendum, due to increased wages as a result of the salaries revision of 1961. No provision was made for the extra amount due to the Jacobs Report, and it is in this category that they have fallen short. The excess at this time was due to an amount of labourers going off suddenly due to illness. Over sixty-five during the last few weeks have taken their holiday, and that is the reason why we have had to come so suddenly with this to deal with it in all its stages today. The whole source,

however, is due to the fact that this was not included in the Estimates after the Jacobs Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I was keeping quiet on this because I think this Resolution is quite necessary, especially when you want to pay these people this money; but I do not quite follow this position. Did Jacobs not make recommendations for the actual increase in wages for persons employed by Government of a minimum of so much per day? Did he not actually say that the amount per day should be increased from \$3 to \$3.25 or \$3.50? I can understand you are not making provision for persons who work a number of days in the year, and are entitled by law to two weeks' leave, but in actual fact Government wages were increased after the Jacobs Report, and if I am wrong, I am willing to stand corrected. I think that is the basis on which everybody works.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, provision was made in the Jacobs Report for the increase of these wages, but not in the Estimates; it was an oversight.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I raised a point which I do not think the Minister understood clearly. He said this is for casual employees, but I said I had also understood that some of the permanent employees have not yet got any leave with pay. Casual labourers are not permanent employees, and I was enquiring about the permanent employees.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I have had no report from anybody on the established staff that he has not received his holiday or his pay that was due, and there are still another five months before the financial year is completed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in actual fact I believe this could be more clarified. I am not trying to take any Minister's place; so the hon. junior member for St. Joseph need not look at me hard. My own experience in this is that the Jacobs Report made recommendations for an increase in wages, but if people put in a certain amount of days and are laid off, the time comes when you owe the money to them at the increased rate, and that is what this is for, in my view. You may possibly have employed 200 or 300 and you might have laid off 150, but they have already put in the 270 or 280 days which qualify them for two weeks at the old wage rate, but the retrospective rate would be at so much, and you therefore actually owe it to them morally and legally. That is the reason I believe for this Resolution and I think that is what the hon. member is driving at here.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end, but there are two questions to which replies are ready, but which were not done today because the hon. members were not in their places. If it is permissible, we can ask for leave to revert to Question Time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may have permission to lay the Replies to the questions now, but the Standing Orders having not been suspended, Question Time automatically expired at 3.15 p.m. o'clock. Let the hon. member lay the Replies.

5.15 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: They are already laid, Mr. Speaker.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for a fortnight until Tuesday, 6th November, 1962, at 12.00 o'clock (noon).

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

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

5.17 p.m.