THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 21st June, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

Messrs. BOXILL, SMITH, HOLDER and SEALEY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the House that there are no Minutes available for confirmation today due principally to the illness of the Clerk.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1963.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provision of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended 30th September, 1962, in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of $3,372 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1963 — 64, No. 6, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of $29,650 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963 — 64, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1963 — 64, No. 7, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Public Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

REPLY LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 124/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael regarding the erection of a post box at the top of St. Stephen's Hill, St. Michael.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Public Employees Pensions Act, 1961, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: 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.

2.55 p.m.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, and the answer has today been laid to Question No. 124 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. Notice of this Question was given on the 14th May, 1963.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think Your Honour will recall that, upon the adjournment of the House last Tuesday, I signified my intention to ask for leave to deal with Government Business. As a matter of fact I said that one of the reasons for asking hon. members to come back today was because we had this large number of outstanding matters, some of which were very urgent, and it was proposed to proceed with Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the Hon. Minister has said is certainly a fact. I only called Questions — Questions are distinct from Private Members' Business. There is only one paper which has been laid today. I would suggest that, instead of the intimation given by the Leader of the House — that, of course, depends on the intimation of the Members of the House towards the intimation of which they have been given a reasonable notice. I do not know whether the hon. member would like to put the Question.

POSTBOX FOR ST. STEPHEN'S HILL

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the Question. To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

Will Government with all convenient despatch cause a postbox to be placed at the top of St. Stephen's Hill in the parish of St. Michael for the use of the inhabitants of Cave Hill, Lodge Hill and the several Housing Schemes nearby?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Oral Reply to the Question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is as follows:

Provision has been included in the Estimates for 1963 - 64 to instal a posting box at the Montgomery School which is at the top of St. Stephen's Hill. This posting box will serve the inhabitants of Cave Hill, Lodge Hill, and the housing scheme nearby.

Mr. SEALEY: I would like to thank you very much.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House intended to do what he had intimated, I think what he should have done was to ask for the suspension of the relevant Standing Orders because we cannot proceed like this. Each day is a different day in itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that the Hon. Leader of the House was merely, in his usual way, advocating that we should proceed along the lines suggested by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Am I to understand that leave has been granted?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand that a request has yet been formally made.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to ask for leave to move the suspension of Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, and 18:

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the entire day's sitting.

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

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

MARRIED WOMAN'S (SEPARATION AND MAINTENANCE) BILL, 1963.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day, under Government Business, stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Married Woman's (Separation and Maintenance) Act, 1950.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the Affiliation Proceedings Bill which was passed in this House on the 21st May this year, it is considered necessary to make the following amendments: An Amendment to Section 3 (b) to provide for an increase in the maximum order for a wife from $9.60 a week to $20 a week and for a child from $2.40 a week to $5.00 a week.

(b) An Amendment to Section 10 to provide that where an Order under the Act or under the Married Woman's Act, 1896 is varied, the maximum payable under such order for the support to the wife should not exceed a weekly sum of $20.

(c) An amendment to Section 11 (b), to provide that where a woman loses an Order against her husband because of adultery but still gets an allowance for the child of her marriage, the maximum of the order should be $25 weekly and not $2.40 as it stands.

(d) Amendment to Section 13, to provide that where an order made under the Married Woman's Act, 1896 is varied, the maximum payable under such Order for the support of a child should not exceed the sum of $5.00.

(e) The deletion of Section 15. In Section 15 of the Bill as it now stands a married woman can only take proceedings against her husband for an order for a maximum of four weeks. The deletion of this Section makes it possible for a married woman to take proceedings in the Court for more than four weeks, if the occasion warrants it.

(f) Inclusion of provision whereby a Court may order a husband to pay a sum not exceeding $20 towards the expenses incidental to the birth and the death of any child of his marriage. Such a child must be under the age of 16 years.

(g) Inclusion of provision for the collection and disbursements of payments by the Clerk of the Court and the enforcement of the payment of arrears.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that similar provision has been made in the Affiliation Proceedings Act, 1962.

(h) The inclusion of provision governing the service of summonses. This also brings this provision in line with the Affiliation Proceedings Act.

(i) Inclusion of provision for registering with the Clerk of the Court the names and addresses of persons against whom Orders for payments are made.

Similar provision is also made in the Affiliation Proceedings Act.
3.05 p.m.

Finally, there is the inclusion of a provision whereby a court may order that payments under the Act be made to the Clerk of the Magistrates' Court of any district. The only other change is that to change from sterling to Eastern Caribbean Currency the penalties provided for in sections 7 and 17 of the Act. These are the provisions embodied in the Draft Amendment Bill.

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this matter, the only thing I want to ask the Hon. Minister something about, is regarding the maximum for a man to pay to his wife which is $20.00. There are some men who are still working for $15.00 a week and they have a wife. I know that a Magistrate can use his discretion, but the Magistrates of today are using very little discretion: they are turning on the heat.

The majority of men may be in a position to pay the maximum but there are some who are working for less than $15.00 a week.

I have also noticed that if a man leaves his wife or deserts her, or is guilty of persistent cruelty to her or to her children that those are some of the grounds for application for orders. I know that there are some women who beat their husbands and chase them away, therefore if you are protecting the women, you should also protect the men.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, it will be said that because the maximum is now put at $20.00 per week that it means that a man who has been ordered to pay would automatically pay $20.00 per week. I think most persons without knowing what it is would have that impression. If I am correct, it remains as it is. It is so, because under the old Act where the maximum is two pounds there are in some cases husbands who can well afford to pay two pounds or even three pounds but were never ordered to pay so much. There is one remedy and that is that one would have to go to the High Court and get divorce proceedings.

The impression must be removed from persons who think that this new provision in any way affects a man who is paying towards the support of his wife or whose income is around the same amount. It is true that Magistrates would have a discretion, but this discretion which they have would be bound to be exercised judicially, and I do not think those persons' fears would be justified, because the same pro-

cedure would be adopted, that is to say, that their means would have to be gone into by the particular department, and if the circumstances warranted, well only then would that man have to pay the maximum.

This is not an attempt to impose on a husband an unnecessary burden and it is known that certain fathers have other lawful or unlawful children. If a father is getting $12.00 a week, no court in the world would order that he pay $20.00 a week to his wife.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is getting on like some section of the Press and if I have to say which section of the Press, I would say it. I remember quite well when we dealt with the Affiliation Bill, one section of the Press came out with a headline caption: "Fathers Must Pay For Their Children". I expect to see in some section of the Press tomorrow the caption: "Husbands Must Pay $20.00 a Week to their Wives". This section of the Press always paints the wrong picture.

I do not know if like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, that section of the Press — and I refer to the Advocate — could not understand the Bill, but any person who can read, knows what it meant by the word maximum and any responsible person knows that when affiliation proceedings are taken out or any sort of orders are made, whether it be for illegitimate children or for a wife, the Probation Officer is called in and he has to go into the means of the persons. There is something called a means test. If a man is working for $15.00 a week, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph pointed out, his other commitments are taken into consideration. After these commitments are taken into consideration by means of a Means Test, which is carried out with the co-operation of the Probation Officer, the Magistrate then determines what the man can afford to pay, and in very rare cases we find that the maximum is put on anyone.

As a matter of fact the hon. junior member for St. Joseph mentioned a man working for $15.00 a week. He did not mention a man working for $100.00 a week, therefore the impression which he is giving is that the man who is working for $100.00 a week must live a swell life, high and mighty as Barbadians put it, and his wife and children must eat the scruff of the earth. I do not share those views, nor does anybody on this side of the House. We feel that your wife and children should live in the same way as you are living, therefore if you can pay $20.00 for your wife and $5.00 for your children per week, you will have to pay it.

Sir, I want to make it abundantly clear that in these days you can expect anything from a certain section of the Press.

3.15 p.m.

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in this Clause there occurs a typographical error and that typographical error is in Sub-section (1) and paragraph (f). That sub-section reads as follows:-

"Any married woman whose husband —

(f) commits adultery,

may, although the cruelty or neglect complained of in the circumstances mentioned in paragraph (e) of Sub-section 1 of this Section has not caused her to leave and live separately and apart from him, apply to the Magistrate of the District in which she or her husband resides for an order or orders under this Act."

The reference to paragraph (e) should be a reference to paragraph (c), I am asking leave, Mr. Chairman, to make that amendment.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee with an amendment.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The Next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House — To move the third reading of a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that that Order be postponed.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 5) ORDER 1963.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order, No. 4 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1963."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause.)* Hearing no objection, the Hon. Leader of the House is granted leave.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the sanction of the House to give approval to the institution of certain very important changes in one of the

most important departments of the Government, that is the Legal Department. You will see, Sir, that there are four main proposals in the Order which is before us.
3.25 p.m.

The first will provide for the reorganised staff structure. Secondly, we want to create a post of Deputy Crown Solicitor. Thirdly, we want to integrate the Provost Marshal's Department with the Registrar's Office, thereby, abolishing the post of Provost Marshal in the meantime. Fourthly, to restore the pre-salary revision of the post of Deputy Registrar with a magisterial post.

It is proposed to sectionalise all the duties of the Department and provide an adequate staff to cope with the work in the Department. According to the Addendum, the duties are divided into three main sections: (1) Advisory and Civil; (2) Criminal; and (3) Legislative Drafting.

The aim is so to reorganise the entire department that the Attorney General will be relieved of many of his duties which consist of mainly routine criminal matters and legislative drafting. The idea is to make him more directly concerned with advisory and civil matters being assisted by an assistant, thereby giving him more time for consulting with departmental heads, Ministries and the Judiciary Advisory Council.

It is felt, in other words, that the Attorney General should not be concerned, from day to day, with normal routine criminal matters but should have time to advise Cabinet and Ministries on matters on which they need advice. Furthermore, in this new proposal, it is felt that the Department would be able more to assist with police prosecutions than is the case at present. It is also felt that we should be able to expedite the increasing volume of legislation which is now sent down to the Legal Department for drafting regularly by the appointment of a senior Parliamentary Counsel whose business it would be to look after these matters.

The Attorney General is now normally responsible for this type of activity, but under the new proposal these things will fall chiefly on the Senior Parliamentary Counsel and the Parliamentary Counsel.

In order to attract experienced people with ability and qualifications to enable them to do the work properly, it is proposed that all posts except that of Crown Counsel be placed on a fixed salary point. The Senior Parliamentary Counsel will be paid $9,480 and will take the place of the Assistant to the Attorney General and Legal Draftsman whose salary structure now is $7,080 rising to $8,040.

When it comes to the posts in the Crown Solicitor's Department, it is proposed to increase the staff by the appointment of a Deputy Crown Solicitor at a fixed salary point of $8,040. It is further proposed that both the Crown Solicitor and his deputy will be permitted to have Articled Clerks attached to them. This, I think, is an innovation, and I hope it will find favour in this House. We are providing opportunities for the training of legal people in a community which, as it advances, must necessarily require more professional and technical people.

The next is the question of integrating the Provost Marshal's Department with the Registrar's Office, and the abolition of the post of Provost Marshal. In order to give effect to this, it is proposed in the implementation of this recommendation to appoint a Chief Marshal on a salary scale of $4,128 — $5,136 whose duty will be to perform certain activities now actually performed by the Provost Marshal and which, it is felt, should not be allocated to the Registrar. The Chief Marshal will be personally responsible in law for such duties performed in his official capacity. In order to provide for such an arrangement, the necessary amendment will be made to the appropriate legislation.
3.35 p.m.

Therefore, you have to abolish your Post of Provost Marshal. His department would now come under the Registrar and you are appointing in place of the Provost Marshal a Chief Marshal at the salary scale proposed to perform the duties which formerly were performed by the Provost Marshal.

Finally, prior to the 1961 Salary Revision the post of Deputy Registrar was graded with the post of Magistrate. The Salaries Commissioner, I think it was Mr. Jacobs, recommended a new grade for Magistrates and retained the old grading for the post of Deputy Registrar. The salary scale proposed by Mr. Jacobs for Magistrates is only recommended for qualified officers.

It is felt that the post of Deputy Registrar should now be filled by Barristers and it should be re-graded and put on the same scale as Police Magistrates.

The Order also seeks to amend Schedule "C" of the principal Order to bring that Schedule in line with the amendments at (a) to (c) above.

Sir, I think the proposals are quite plainly set out and I must say that this is necessary because the prevailing circumstances are such that so often important matters come before the Legislature get bogged down in the Legal Department from lack of enough people to do the drafting and, furthermore, if the Head of the Department, the Attorney General, has to concern himself from day to day with routine matters like drafting and work in the Criminal Department, it means that he is not as available as he should be to give a proper advice to Departmental Heads and so on, who may need such advice.

It is therefore to be expected that legislation would come down to the House more expeditiously and that the bottleneck in material and capital decisions will almost be entirely removed. There is any amount of legislation already endorsed by the Cabinet, but at the moment it cannot come down to the Legislature because it is impossible with the present staff to get it drafted before.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has spent a long time on this Resolution and I must say that I have no general objections to the re-classification and re-organization of the Legal Department, but I do not think the answers given here in the Addendum and even the answers given by the Hon. Leader of the House are satisfactory.

I would like to know really what is the position in so far as the Attorney General is concerned. I read in the newspapers that the Attorney General or the acting Attorney General and the Minister without Portfolio have gone to the United Kingdom to talk about constitutional changes. I would like to know what constitutional changes you have in mind and to what extent they are going to effect these proposals, because I understand it is the intention of the Government to have a political Attorney General for which we have already approved, and if a political Attorney General were appointed, I want to know if it is the intention of the Government to retain the present position of Attorney General.

Sir, you are aware of the law on British Constitution that although the Attorney General may be a political Attorney General, that he is still the person responsible for advice as regards criminal proceedings which have to take place in the name of the State although he may not be the person who may do the prosecuting. You will remember that a Conservative Government in England found itself in an embarrassing position for which the Attorney General was going to bring proceedings with respect to security matters against Mr. Baldwin's Government and as you know the Attorney General is above the Prime Minister in so far as legal proceedings are concerned. If he decides today to take out legal proceedings against anybody, there is nobody who can stop him.

In a small community like this, I have no objection to a political Attorney General, but I have serious objections

to your having a political Attorney General who is not going to act as an Attorney General, but who is going to be somebody's yard fowl.

I want to know what is going on! This is dealing with the administration of justice. This Addendum says that the Attorney General will still be the Head of the entire department, but would be relieved of his present duties associated with the criminal matters and legislative drafting. That is not difficult for me to understand.

I have been in this House of Assembly for many years and I cannot quite understand why this phrase has been put in this Addendum. The Attorney General gets a salary of $11,000 per annum and we have agreed to the appointment of a Crown Counsel to relieve the Attorney General of routine criminal matters. There was a time when the Attorney General appeared in court as a routine matter, and at one time he was also a member of this place. I do not know what has happened in modern times, but all the legal people tell you that there is this volume of legislation with which they have to deal. It is true that we are passing more legislation than formerly, but we have more people to deal with it and they are appointed at better salaries and under better conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Attorney General is at present relieved of these particular routine matters, and I am sorry that today Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, a former member of this Chamber who is resting in his grave is not in this House because when he was in here, he was a strong advocate that these Civil Establishment Orders should not be debated before Your Honour, but should be done in Committee because in effect these Orders were money Resolutions. He said that we were in effect agreeing to the passing of a money Resolution, but doing it as an abstract Resolution to which you had no right to reply.

This Resolution seeks to increase the posts in the Legal Department and what is happening is that the Executive Committee has already passed an Order and you have heard from the Hon. Premier that there cannot be a legislative enactment until we approve of the Act. We have already given this Department the post of Crown Counsel and it is not anything new when you are telling us that the Attorney General is not to deal with criminal matters, because we were told in a former Order that he would be relieved from dealing with criminal matters.

In the present structure there is the Attorney General, the Assistant to the Attorney General and Legal Draughtsmen, the Crown Counsel and the Assistant Legal Draguhtsman, but what we find here in this Addendum and which has not been made clear is that in addition to the present posts which are here, there is also the post of Solicitor General.
3.45 p.m.

That would give the impression that this is the complement. There is also the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General is at a salary of $9,480. If you have the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, the Assistant to the Attorney General and Legal Draughtsman, all of these people are presumably with absolute qualifications to do the work. When I look at Order No. 5 and see what is proposed, I would like to know about this. All of those people are barristers-at-law and I am saying that you are making life comparatively secure for the barristers, and you want to put all of them at fixed salaries in order to attract people. I am not against a man getting a fixed salary but what I am going to ask the Hon. Leader of the House is this: What are the differences which you are making between legal men and medical men who come within the same scope? You tell a doctor who has to take seven years in order to be qualified, that he has to go by stages whereas the position here with these legal men is different. These legal men are at fixed salaries. I am saying that soon and very soon you will be creating a sort of middle-class bureaucracy by which you will become like the "untouchables" and you have to bring them in a ring like this. The Attorney General has to do everything. Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I said Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we have become accustomed to adressing Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: That shows the regard which you have for the Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you do have a slip of the tongue at times. The question is that in England if there is a decision to be made, it has to be made by the Attorney General and not the Cabinet. Whether he is a political Attorney General or a Civil Servant the position is still the same, because his legal functions will not be changed.

You are passing legislation for persons and there is no principle involved here. They want to recruit certain persons and they want to pay certain salaries in order to put certain people in jobs. As the Addendum to this Resolution reads here: "In order to attract experienced officers for appointment to posts in the re-organized Department, all posts except that of Crown Counsel have been placed on a fixed salary point."

The Government has come down with a new salary scale for the Legal Department; I hope I do not hear any nonsense about Civil Servants coming down with any bill at an election and you are leaving the bill in our hands now because it will cost us more money. As soon as a man is a professional man you believe that he eats a different kind of food from somebody else or that he lives in outer space. My belief is that if people are qualified their qualification would entitle them to a better salary than if they were not qualified, but that salary must have some relationship with the community in which we live.

Since I have been here for all of these years we have been hearing of Governments telling you about legislation and whenever it is finished we find that the legislation for practical purposes amounts to nothing; but to each legal head you introduce a little change. The Addendum to this Resolution does not tell you what the Solicitor General has to do; the Attorney General would not have to do much routine work and therefore you remove him, but somebody else has to do the work and who is doing the work which the Attorney General was doing? You can bring in machinery which will prevent the barristers from working. I am worried about this matter because I do not like this top-heavy business being pushed in and I want to know what will happen that you will have a senior Parliamentary Counsel who would be second in command and you have the assistant to the Attorney General. It says here in the Addendum that: "Under the proposed arrangement, the Department will be able to assist with police prosecutions in the magistrate's courts to a much greater extent than at present and would be available for consultation with the Police at the earliest stages of investigation into cases of serious crime. The volume of legislation to be drafted has grown considerably in recent years and the existing practice is that this work has had to be divided amongst all the officers in the Department. It is now proposed that these duties should fall principally to the Senior Parliamentary Counsel and the Parliamentary Counsel.
3.55 p.m.

Why is it that the Legal Department will be placed in this special position at this time? This is not a review of the salaries in the Civil Service. We had a Salaries Revision Commission that came here, and I believe that the Commission would have made these changes. It is true that the Salaries Revision Commission spoke about the Provost Marshal's Department, but I do not see where the Legal Department comes in. It is difficult for me to agree to this from what is stated in the Addendum.

I would like to hear a little more than the statement: "The functions of the Legal Department may be divided into three Sections." You have three people there and it is now proposed to add a few more people at fixed salary points, which means that all the people who are drawing a salary at $7,080 will immediately go to $8,040. It means that this is going to cost you more immediately, and in the structure of the Legal Department you will find people performing some of these duties now.

For example, the Crown Counsel will get $8,040. The Assistant to the Legal Draughtsman and the Assistant to the Attorney General will get $8,040, and it means that there

will be an immediate increase. I am not quibbing over people getting the maximum of their salaries. What I am saying is that if you increase the salaries in the Legal Department, I cannot see how you can ignore the Officers in the Agriculture Department, the Medical Department and all of the other professional Departments who would have as much justification for getting an increase in salary as anybody else.

I would really like to know what is the position regarding the post of Attorney General. Will the post of Attorney General be a political one? I hope I am not asking you to let out any secrets, but I think it would be proper for the Leader of the House to tell us what other constitutional changes he proposes to make. Parliament is not regarded as an outside body in this matter, and the members of this House should be told these things. I read in a newspaper that the Attorney General and somebody have gone to Britain to talk about constitutional changes. What kind of constitutional changes are they considering? Are you considering constitutional changes with a view to independence or what? We should know at least what these constitutional changes are.

I do not think there is much more I can say on this matter. I know that some of these Departments have been manned in a loose way for many years, and some people may now find themselves in an invidious position and these proposals might create more difficulty. I understand through the grape-vine, that we may pass this today and then find created for ourselves great difficulties even within the departments themselves. You will hear the outcry that the changes are based upon whether certain persons are pleased or displeased with you.

However, my main concern is from a legislative point of view, and I would like to know more about the constitutional changes regarding the Attorney General and the Legal Department. An explanation would set my mind at rest, and I would know the road on which we are travelling. I am not opposed to the reorganisation of any department, but you must reorganise the Government department with the clear understanding that you will not deal with departments in isolation. You must also consider what is likely to take place in the other departments. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to give me an answer to some of the points which I have raised in this matter, because we are increasing the salaries of certain people.

I am always very outspoken, because I am not going to sit in this House at any time and hear it said that some people do not like others; they say they cannot give them anything more, and then you tell others that you will give them favourable treatment. I am going to be clamouring at all times for fair treatment for everybody. If you are giving some people favourable treatment, then everybody should get the same treatment.

You talk about professional men, and this is what the Barbadian must understand: it is no point in asking some people in the lower bracket to make sacrifices when you are giving others big salaries. You are not trying to get cheap labour. You are going to ask me not to press the employer for more wages. You are not creating in the minds of some professional people that they must make sacrifices in serving the country. They cannot expect to get in Barbados the salaries they can get in Tanganyika, Australia and other countries.

Some people say they cannot pay income tax; some say that they cannot find an area where they can live because they want to get away from poor people; some people cannot find use for the money they are getting. Do they want an aeroplane to go and kill themselves? All of these $9,000 and $10,000 jobs that the Hon. Minister is talking about are not in consonance with the $20 a week paid to some workers. I am not going to be involved in underwriting wages for any period in a community the level of which should be higher. I am not going to support these serfdom attitudes. If some sections of our community expect to be given exclusive treatment at the expense of the majority of workers in this country, I will not be in favour of that. Lawyers, doctors, agriculturists, and everybody must make a contribution in Barbados, and that contribution must be made in relation to the community in which we live. It is no point telling the poor man in the streets that he cannot expect an increase in wages and when a man becomes a professional, he gets what he wants. In England, you have the Lord Chief Justice and you have billions of dollars to take care of salaries. One of the aspects of colonialism is that certain persons have left with us the urge or desire to get rich quickly. Everybody here wants to follow somebody else. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am very serious. You have this peculiar attitude which is prevailing and I think it will increase our cost beyond what is necessary. I am not opposed to paying people good salaries, but as soon as you start with one branch, it is not going to end there. I can imagine what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would say when I ask him what are you going to say about your medical men. You are in charge of your medical departments; what are they going to say when they find out that their counterparts who are the same professional people as they, are enjoying these sort of facilities? You pay them higher salaries; they get pensions and gratuities and whenever you have finished you are paying them a salary of not less than $1,000 per month. This is nothing which you can sneeze at, and that is why I take a serious view of these proposals. It means increasing the cost of this Island's administration.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter asked me how I feel in this matter in relation to the medical profession. I believe the hon. member would recall that I said from the inception that as soon as Barbados became the place where medical students could be interned, and I made the position clear that it was the ideal place where students could be trained, and that you will have to pay them good salaries, and you would even have to give nurses better salaries. I made a comparison with the United States and the United Kingdom.

Sir, as far as this Resolution is concerned, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, in principle I am not disagreeing with the reorganisation of the Legal Department, but the Hon. Leader of the House who is in charge of this Resolution ought to be able to tell us more. For instance, he ought to be able to tell us the reason for the changing of titles of these officers and paying fixed salaries immediately as they take up the post. The post of Crown Counsel was created at great expense. The argument used in the Addendum, and by the Hon. Leader of the House is that this was done to attract the best men in the area to these posts. As far as I am concerned, I still think that there is something more which the Hon. Minister of Trade should tell us.

It is proposed that the present post of Assistant Attorney General and Legal Draughtsman, Crown Counsel, Assistant Legal Draughtsman should be changed to that of Senior Parliamentary Counsel, Assistant to the Attorney General, Parliamentary Counsel, Senior Crown Counsel and Crown Counsel. Well, judging for myself, it would appear when I read this that there was going to be the abolition of the office of Solicitor General. As far as the Attorney General is concerned, I think myself that there would be a political Attorney General under the new setup. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has asked a question about it and we have seen it in the Press that members of the Government have gone to England for the purpose of discussing constitutional changes. Whether we are to be enlightened as to what these changes are, I do not know. We have not heard that the office of Solicitor General would be abolished, but I assume from these changes that that office would be abolished. All these offices which are proposed are entitled to these fixed salaries; they are not going up by increments. It is proposed in this Resolution that these new offices should be paid a fixed salary.

What the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is correct. If you are going to pay a fixed salary to a legally trained man, professional men who are employed by Government in other fields are going to raise the question of your making a difference between them and legally trained men, by giving the legally trained men a fixed salary.

They are going to ask why are you making the differentiation between us and legally trained men and giving them a fixed salary. You will also get teachers asking that because they are very fond of saying so. I am sure you will get the medical men raising that question. Therefore while I have no objection to the change of titles and possibly to the increase of number, there is the question of paying them fixed salaries.

I will tell you the reason why I have no fear. If it is the intention of the Government to assist the statutory boards or bodies which are set up by the Government and which presently engage or retain counsel at very fabulous salaries, by giving them the opportunity of getting advice from the Government's Legal Department, I can clearly see a saving. Let us deal with the Senior Counsel and the Crown Counsel whom you propose to get in addition to those whom you at present have in your Department. I can very well think of the Housing Authority, the Housing Loan Board and the Agricultural Credit Bank. Those statutory bodies pay out salaries to counsel or retainers which would more than pay these officers. If you are going to attach these boards to your departments which are entitled to legal advice; if it is the intention of the Government that these legal officers will deal with all matters of Government Departments and these statutory bodies, though not directly a department of Government, then there can be no objection.

Dealing with the Provost Marshal Department, if I recall rightly, there were two officers, Provost Marshal and Public Trustee. I see that mention is only made of the Provost Marshal so I think the Hon. Minister should tell me something about the other office and what has been done about that. According to this, you are only having a Chief Marshal. A Chief Marshal cannot perform the duties of a legal man; he cannot perform the duties of Official Assignee; therefore, I wonder if these duties will be transferred to the Deputy Registrar who will be appointed at the salary of a Magistrate.

Sir, I have no objection to this change because I believe myself that the change would have a tendency of working better and although it has not been put to us, in effect, it can mean a saving to the Government when you take over the entire situation. We want to know whether you are abolishing the post of Solicitor General and if it is politic for you to say right now on the floor of the House that you are appointing a political Attorney General. As long as we are moving forward, there is no reason why you cannot appoint a political Attorney General, although there are certain rights which he has which even the Prime Minister of Great Britain would not be able to tell him anything about, such as what prosecution he should institute. It would be still his right to say whether such and such a prosecution should be proceeded with.
4.15 p.m.

I do not think that any of us should have any fear about that. As to the Crown Presecutor and Parliamentary Counsel, I can quite see the reasons for changing his name. The Legal Draughtsmen as such, as I understand it, are engaged in doing the work of preparing bills, etc. for this House. If it is the modern way of saying "Parliamentary Counsel" whether it is to the Cabinet, the Government or whatever it is, in actual fact, I see that the maximum salaries are no more than in the case of the Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the other point which I would like to make is this: To me it is a step in the right direction to have an Assistant Queen's Solicitor. The Queen's Solicitor charges no fees; he has to carry out all the Government's work, but what I am worried about is this: With the Civil Service loans and all of this work in respect of the various Boards, there seems to be the necessity for this appointment and you will have a saving as long as this Officer is told that he will have to do the work which has to be done in connection with these Boards. No fees are charged now, and as long as no fees are charged, I see that a saving will be effected there.

As to the Constitutional changes about which the hon. senior member for St Peter has queried, I know that there are things which were flashed about in the Press and it is not proper to bring out such things until the appropriate time arrives. I think that we ought to know what the true position is. I offer no opposition to this matter but I would like some further explanation of it from the Hon. Leader of the House. I would like him to tell us something more. There was a person or rather there used to be the office of Public Trustee. This office was abolished not so many years ago. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us what has become of the office of Official Assignee, how it will be linked with the office of Registrar and what is to be done? I believe it can be argued that no one can do the work of the Court of Grand Sessions along with the work of the House; but there was a time when much more legislation was passed than what is being passed now. Indeed, you passed legislation in three months of the year at that time that would be passed in a year now. The then Attorney General did quite a lot of the work in here, but it was not as much work as it is now. Of course, it is very difficult to get a man of the energy of the man who did the work in here. There was nobody who would offer any great deal of opposition: as a matter of fact, a Resolution like this which we have before us would have gone through in five or six minutes. Therefore no comparison can be made there. However, Sir, I would like an explanation as to the other point which I have rasied. I warn the Hon. Minister as to what the hon. member has said that the reasons for giving the maximum salary to such officers is to attract the best men in the area, I think you would get it thrown back at you when you come to the medical fraternity and professional men in their fields in this country — I think you should be very particular about that. Let the hon. member help us on these matters.

Hon. E.W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I was not here during the course of the debate and I will try, both from what I have heard and from the information which I have received, to answer the questions posed by hon. members on the other side. As to some of those questions, I am in a position to answer them and as to the others, I do not think that this is the appropriate time to answer them, because they are not necessarily germane to debate which is now in progress. When you look first at the way in which the addendum to the Resolution has been set out — it has been set out in that manner as a basis of comaprison between the posts which exist at the present moment and those which it is proposed to introduce by means of this Order. At the present moment, if I may do a little recapitulation, the Legal Department is composed of the Attorney General as head, the Solicitor General, then the Assistant to the Attorney General and then there are, I believe, Assistant Legal Draughtsmen and Crown Counsel.
4.25 p.m.

That is the present establishment. Under the new establishment, we propose to have an Attorney General and his assistant. Then alongside of them, will be a Parliamentary Counsel who will be normally under the control of the Attorney General but will be working in very close cooperation with the Secretary to the office of Premier as is done in Trinidad in the Prime Minister's office.

In Barbados, you have to leave all of these departments under the Attorney General as the leader of the Bar. The Attorney General and his assistant will be in one compartment, then the Parliamentary Counsels — we have called them Parliamentary Counsels deliberately, because we do not want them being transferred to the post of Magistrate or called upon to act as Registrar or anything like that. We will have two Parliamentary Counsels who were formerly described at Legal Draughtsmen.

In the third stream — it is not provided for in this Resolution because we still have a Solicitor General — we propose to have a Director of Public Prosecutions, and in his office the post of Solicitor General will, therefore, be abolished. We cannot abolish the office of Solicitor General right away because there is a substantive holder of that post at the moment. In order to complete fully our constitutional changes, it will not be politic to abolish the post of Solici-

tor General at the moment. In any event, the creation of the post of Director of Public Prosecutions, calls for very careful drafting which is almost complete at the present moment.

The whole idea is to make it abundantly clear that the question of prosecution in Court is not a political matter, but under the control of a Director of Public Prosecutions whose duties will be defined in a Statute, and he will be subjected only to the overriding fiat of the Attorney General. The Director of Public Prosecutions will normally have nothing to do with the Cabinet or the Legislature. He will be completely independent, and under him you will have Crown Counsel, Senior Crown Counsel, Junior Crown Counsel. You will have to divide the columns in the Addendum, and look at the three separate compartments. The first column will be advisory as at the present moment. He will have an Attorney General who will have nothing whatsoever to do with the Courts and Grand Sessions. He will not represent the Government in Court except in cases of great national importance. You know the system in the United States, Sir.

Then the second stream will be people who will specialize in drafting legislation and doing nothing else but drafting legislation practically all day long. Departments will not be able to call on them for opinions on any matter other than the drafting of legislation. They cannot be called upon by the Controller of Supplies or the Ministry of Agriculture to give advice about the planting of canes or any matter of that kind.

In the third compartment you will have your Director of Public Prosecutions, and for him at the present moment you are substituting the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General will be taking the place of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the moment. He will have two or three Crown Counsels who will assist the police in the prosecution of offenders in the court and give them advice on investigation prior to the presentation of cases to the court. That roughly is the reorganisation of the Legal Department which is envisaged by the Government.

With regard to the appointment of the Deputy Crown Solicitor, I think that that is self-explanatory. There is something, perhaps, which I should add. In the office of the Crown Solicitor, we have at the present moment, one Clerk and one Stenographer. There is a tremendous volume of work coming forward in connection with the construction of the East Coast Road and the acquisition of various properties for the expansion of housing and other developments. There are mortgages and conveyances which will have to be prepared by the Housing Authority as a result of the decision recently taken by the Authority to sell all the single-unit houses to the occupiers who want to buy them. They have passed a Resolution that, in order to save cost to the tenants, a prototype of the mortgages should be prepared by the Crown Solicitor's Department in order to save cost to the respective purchasers. The registration of a title of a piece of land and the cost of conveyancing in this Island is relatively high; It is not due to the whim of solicitors in the profession, but it is due to the fees fixed by the law. We are doing something about that, and we have established a Committee to go into the matter. Only this morning the Committee was established to go into the whole question of the registration and title of land, and as soon as the cadastral survey of the Island is done and simplified it will reduce the cost of conveyancing to the average citizen. Until this is done, there is still a lot of work that the Crown Solicitor will be called upon to do.

We are therefore appointing a Deputy Crown Solicitor with an addition which is not mentioned here in the Order. The staff is now composed of three persons; a Crown Solicitor, one Clerk and one Stenographer Typist. We are saying that each qualified solicitor in the Crown Solicitor's Office should be entitled to have two Articled Clerks, and that two of these Clerks should be paid by the Government in order to assist with the volume of work and they will be paid at the same salary scale as the present holder of the office. His Clerk, who is not an articled clerk, is likely to leave in order to qualify as a solicitor. You have clerks doing the work of a Solicitor's Clerk and they are not qualified. In some other territories, it is possible for a man working with a Crown Solicitor to qualify as a solicitor.

Therefore, any entrant to the Civil Service can apply to go into the Crown Solicitor's Department as an articled clerk. It will be optional for the Deputy Crown Solicitor and the Crown Solicitor to say whether they want to take on an articled clerk who is not paid by the Government, or one who is paid by the solicitor or by private arrangement. It is necessary to give articled clerks a stipend to cover bus fare. Government is now creating facilities, not only for people to be qualified in certain subjects at universities but as solicitors as well.

4.35 p.m.

By the rules, no solicitor is allowed more than two articled clerks so the number in training in Barbados at any one time is necessarily limited to the number of practising solicitors, therefore, if we are removing two solicitors out of circulation, it is only fair that we do so in a manner which would not inhibit the chances of people who want to join this profession, so we thought it fit that in our appointing two solicitors that each should have an Articled Clerk. The present post of Solicitor General does not have an Articled Clerk attached to it but the person does the same kind of work which an Articled Clerk is doing. With the new regulation, it would now be possible for anyone holding a university degree to qualify in a shorter period than before, that is to say, in three years instead of five years. Therefore, there again, it is essential that people acquire good academic qualifications come in this general branch of the profession and raise themselves.

The other part of the Order provides for the integration of the Provost Marshal's Department with the Registrar's Office, thereby abolishing the post of Provost Marshal. Now, here there is this rather peculiar anomaly. Prior to the 1961 Salaries Revision, the post of Deputy Registrar was graded with the post of Magistrate and the Deputy Registrar received the same salary as a Magistrate. A recommendation was put in by the Salaries Commissioner that the Deputy Registrar should start at a higher salary than Magistrates but not end at a salary higher than what Magistrates could get at the maximum. That was a recommendation which was unanimous both by the Civil Service Association and the incumbent of the post.

No request has emanated from anyone but looking at this situation and looking at the Establishment generally and job evaluation, the Government came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to put back the post of Deputy Registrar on the same salary scale as Magistrates which means that the Deputy Registrar would now end higher than what he was getting under the Jacob's Salaries Commission and at the same place as Magistrates.

The reason is this. We have to regard certain posts in the Legal Departments as interchangeable such as the posts of Crown Counsel, Deputy Registrar and Magistrate. I would not like to say Parliamentary Counsel but certainly the posts of Junior Crown Counsel, Magistrate and Deputy Registrar are interchangeable, because of people going on leave below Deputy Registrar, you have to ask a Magistrate or Junior Crown Counsel to act. We also have to regard the posts of Senior Parliamentary Counsel, Assistant to the Attorney General and Crown Solicitor as being on the same level for the same object of free mobility and interchangeability because they are not always available legally qualified people whom you can call upon to act other than in those three Departments, therefore, it would mean including people from outside if somebody is ill and you will have to pay them special salaries beyond all levels. The Assistant to the Attorney General and the Senior Parliamentary Counsel are getting the same salary which is the same as the maximum of the Magistrates, so that you can now call in Magistrates to go into one of these departments and act without impunity because his position would not be lower.

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter although he may find it strange, but if he was following these debates for the past twelve years with the diligence which he usually puts into these matters, he will understand that I always said that we should not have people in this community thinking that they have a special privilege attached to them either because of the colour of their skin or pro-

fessional qualifications or because they are members of the Civil Service. I have said on several occasions that we find people, particularly those in the Government Service, who act as if they were an army of occupation. We do have such people but we try to break them off that bad mental trait but it does not mean that we have to fly off the handle and oppose anybody. The long period of Labour Party rule in this colony is something which we will be inflicted with for a long time.

If this Party said that we would return to the people at the end of three years to demonstrate the inertia that existed before and to show that we have put into effect all the things we said in our Manifesto though it does not necessarily mean that all would be completed and we can go down to Westbury Road, no right thinking man or men of goodwill would expect that we could complete those things in that short time because it would take a tremendous lot of brain washing to wash out some of the iniquities out of the body politic and the sickness which prevails over such a long time. Therefore I do not think that every Resolution which comes to this House should be taken as an opportunity to brand everybody who is a professional man as an inflated superior.

In every single community and even in the Trade Union movement, it is recognised that there is a scarcity value attached to qualifications. A lot of people may not get qualified as osteopaths or undertakers but there has been never any shortage of people ready and willing to come forward and perform those functions, some with success but some with disaster even of nations. You will find today that there is a terrific shortage of accountants and of engineers in many countries and the man who is an accountant or nuclear scientist can get a job in any part of the world and immigration laws mean absolutely nothing when it comes to certain qualifications.
4.45 p.m.

Even in the United States of America any Barbadian who has certain qualifications today is exempt virtually from the iniquity of the quota imposed by the McClarran Act. Even ministers of religion of whom there is never any shortage even to go down to the Town Hall and perform a ceremony — even they have a right to enter into the United States of America. We are losing hundreds of Nurses from the Hospital because, despite the fact that there is a quota for nurses, they enter with a high priority. When you come to the farm workers, over one thousand of them are in the United States of America, who have not been through the immigration process and the McClarran Act does not apply to them. There are quite a lot of people in Barbados who do not have any jobs but every Barbadian must try to qualify himself to be something. I say that because this is the age of the specialists and the people who walk about and say that they do not have any job, it is perhaps through no fault of their own, that they do not have a marketable commodity. A specialist is a man who can demand as of right; the architect and the accountant are in a special society to demand a higher level of salary than the man who is not qualified. When you come to the cane-cutters, some of them I know are more skilled than some of the factory workers I know, but the point is that the more skilled a person is, the greater is his economic mobility.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is entirely a fair criticism to say that we give people money because they are professional people. All the facts have to be taken into consideration in order to evaluate the kind of salary structure which a person should have within the Establishment. As to the Office of Public Trustee, I am not quite certain about that. The Provost Marshal was the administrator of estates and these duties were transferred to the Crown Solicitor some time ago. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking purely from memory now, but the duties of administrator of estates were transferred to the Crown Solicitor. For about three or more years a Senior Clerk who was not a qualified Senior Officer has been performing the duties of Provost Marshal; but it does not mean that by integrating the Department we will be expecting the Registrar to carry out the duties or to perform all of these functions; because there will be a Chief Marshal who will be liable in law for such duties which are performed in his official capacity.

Under the old Act, the Provost Marshal was personally responsible for any miscarriage in the performance of his duties. He did not come under doctrine that the Crown can do no wrong. He was not regarded as an officer of the Crown because he was vested with the authority of levying on people's property and he was liable to be sued in the Courts before we had the Crown Proceeding Act. The Chief Marshal still has some responsibility and the Registrar will not be put in that position being personally responsible for the Chief Marshal to whom the liability will fall in such cases.

I think that some hon. members made reference to the Constitutional Changes. Since that does not arise out of this Resolution, I would prefer — I do not know whether it is advisable or inadvisable; but we cannot fetter the right of Her Majesty's Government to suggest anything to us or that we should accept or regret anything which has been put forward. The Constitutional Changes are not those which would be discussed by people in this country before or by members of this House today, by members of the past Government or by this Government. We did say or it was said in the Speech from the Throne that the Constitution of Barbados could be put in one volume. Certain amendments to the Letters Patent, which can only be done by Her Majesty-in-Council, are anticipated and we have now decided that, as there is a revision going on, all the Constitutional instruments would be put into one volume of the new laws. These will include the Letters Patent and Royal Instructions going through the statutes relating to the Constitution of Barbados and will include provision for the Establishment of a Director of Prosecutions. In that case, no one will be in any doubt as to the right and freedom of the rule of law.
4.55 p.m.

There are other changes which I cannot speak about with certainty because they have to be approved. I do not think that members of the House will be opposed to the idea, because, on some occasion or other, opinions have been expressed on the other changes which we are hoping to bring about before the end of this year.

I do not think there is very much more I can usefully add at this stage. I do not know if there are any questions which I have not answered, because I was out of the Chamber for a short period.

Mr. SPEAKER: Instead of making a point of order, just let me ask the hon. member to give way, which is the more desirable practice. *(Pause)*

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ORDER ENTITLED "THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1963

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable offices) (Amendment) Order, 1963."

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion.

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

THE PROVOST MARSHAL (CONSTRUCTION OF REFERENCES) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to provide for the construction of references to the Provost Marshal in the Acts and subsidiary legislation of the Island and in certain legal documents consequent upon the abolition of that office and to the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which we now have before us is consequential on the Resolution which

we discussed a short while ago. It is self explanatory and I do not think that, after what I have said before about the reorganisation of the Registrar's Department, members will want me to dilate on the Objects and Reasons of this Bill.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, a full explanation was not made about the breakdown of this office. All the hon. Premier said was that there was a division of work which necessitated the appointment of a Crown Solicitor, and that some of the work in the Provost Marshal's Office and the Office of Public Trustees — work which required legally trained persons to handle it — was transferred to the Crown Solicitor's Department. But what this whole situation has revealed is that there is in all of these offices a portion of work to be done that could be done by persons other than legally qualified persons.

As you very well know, Mr. Speaker, the question of qualifications will make us embark on more expenses. Whether you are a lawyer or a doctor, you have to pursue training prior to the examination. You have to acquire training before. I know that work goes on in these offices during these periods.

In a Solicitor's office, you will find work done by persons other than solicitors, but the solicitors take the responsibility for it. Work that is not necessarily legal work can be done in a Legal Department by an ordinary person. In the Provost Marshal's Office, the work that is going to be done by the Chief Marshal will be done by a person other than a legally trained person.

I would like to know something about the Legal Department and the situation in this Chamber. You had a situation in which this House was summoned to the Other Place by the Sergeant-at-Arms. The reason why I asked that is because on one occasion someone was dressed up in ceremonial robes to perform this function. He was a bit of a comic strip with the ceremonial paraphernalia in his hand. The Hon. Speaker said that somebody was acting for three years. I understand that the officer has been acting for nearly six years. It is a strange situation to find that officers are acting for so many years and nothing is being done to put things right. That sort of attitude stultifies people and precludes them from being exposed to promotion. Sometimes the holder of a post might get immediate advantage, but on a long-term basis, he may find himself at a disadvantage. It is not in the interest of the Civil Service to have people acting in offices for such long periods if they cannot get an equivalent salary when they are removed. The person concerned was holding a valuable office, but the net result of the overall situation is likely to create a peculiar situation for him. I mention that because I have said here already that I do not like to see long acting appointments when the parties may be subsequently displaced because the posts have been abolished.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: With regard to the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, no specialist qualification has been placed upon the post of Chief Marshal and Sergeant-at-Arms.

5.05 p.m.

The qualification for the post of Provost Marshal was usually that of barrister or solicitor. Since the legal side of it has been taken away and transferred, the qualification of barrister or solicitor is not attached to this office, so people who are members of the Public Service can go upward through this department and look this way to some kind of promotion right up to the post of Chief Marshal and Sergeant-at-Arms.

There was a proposal that this should be an office reserved for someone with qualifications but Government did not accept that recommendation and particularly so, since the person performing the duties up to the present is not a legal qualified person, I myself had forgotten the sight of anyone other than the present holder of the acting appointment performing the duties, so, as I have said, it is not necessary to be legally qualified to be appointed.

The office of Chief Marshal and the salary as proposed is not on the same level as that of Deputy Registrar but then it is still a considerably better salary than that of Chief Clerk because it is at the level of Administrative Assistant in the Civil Service and the salary scale is $4,128 — $5,136, which is in the segment of G. 4 in like manner as people holding the offices of Chief Inspector of Highways and Transport, the Accountant in the Accountant-General Department, Assistant Executive Secretary, Auditor, Account, Department of Science and Agriculture, Senior Probation Officer, Sports Officer, Accountant, Waterworks Department, Senior Laboratory Technician and Administrative Officer, Public Works. Therefore, you will see that a lot has been taken away but the salary is still reasonable and it is promotion from the ranks up.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 5 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 18 POSTPONED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 18 be the next Order of the day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 18 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; second reading of a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if that Bill has been circulated amongst hon. members, because I have been looking for my copy and I have not seen it here. As I see from the Order Paper, notice of this Bill was given on the 18th June, which was last Tuesday and I doubt very much that it has been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand that copies have not been circulated?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I really do not know. I will have to check on it. *(After a check.)* I will have to withdraw my consideration of it now.

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORISE GOVERNOR-IN-EXECUTIVE TO BORROW

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 12 be the next Order of the day.

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

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

5.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORISE LOANS BY THE ISSUE OF TREASURY BILLS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to borrow, by the issue of Treasury Bills, sums not exceeding one million dollars and such sums as may be required to pay off at maturity such Bills as are already issued and outstanding.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which seeks authority to increase the amounts which may be borrowed by the issue of Treasury Bills from time to time for short-term financing of the Ways and Means vote, to put it in that way, to raise the amount which it is proposed to borrow by the issue of these Bills from one million dollars to two million dollars. I do not think I need explain, Sir, that the advance of Treasury Bills is a well-known financial device employed by Governments who advertise for tenders for these Bills and the person who is prepared to give the amount of money at the lowest rate of interest is usually awarded that amount of Treasury Bills. They pay the money over to the Treasury and at the end of 90 days they are entitled to the percentage which they paid for these Bills. This is a very useful procedure because the Government does not get money flowing regularly at all times of the year. At one time it is down to a trickle and at other times of the year when people have had time to consider their income tax and demand note and make provision for them, that trickle assumes the proportion of a relentless flood coming into the Treasury. Then it begins to taper off again towards the new year, and so the cycle continues. Money which is obtained in this way is not used for capital projects. I do not think that the general public in Barbados fully appreciates the usefulness of this device to the businessman who may be waiting for machinery to arrive or for motor cars or trucks or buses; he can earn a quick interest within ninety days by buying Treasury Bills. To the public and the entrepreneur this is something which is capable of conferring great reward; the volume of public transaction is doubled. We have found that the issue of one million dollars is not normally sufficient. We have other sources which we can tap but if interest is going to be earned by the issue of Treasury Bills, I think that Barbadians should have the priority for putting money in these Bills, otherwise the interest accrues to somebody outside of Barbados. I do not think that this matter will cause hon. members any difficulty; I do not think they will find any difficulty in supporting this Resolution. The issue of Treasury Bills inside the island is something which has only started a few years ago. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing against this Resolution but what I have been noticing in Barbados in a large way is that although this Government projects the idea of encouraging savings, I find that, on the other hand, there should be some incentives granted. When you come to things like Treasury Bills where the Government raises some money and where you want to encourage people to save money, this is what you should do if you want to encourage people; you should be granting these incentives for the encouragement of people. We want to publicise these things. The suggestion has been put forward that in the issue of Treasury Bills for short term loans you should do what is done in the United Kingdom. It is the sort of thing which you would limit because you do not want many people with large incomes to monopolise things like this.

I am suggesting that the issue of Treasury Bills should be made in respect of moderate-sized organization. I would like to see places like my own organization, in time to come, put in a position where we can use our savings. I think it is a good thing that that projection has been given so as to provide incentives for these things. It is a better plan than placing money in the Bank. This is something which is normal and there could not be any objection made to it.

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

5.25 p.m.

THE RATES OF INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 14 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the next Order of the Day be Order No. 14, which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Rates of Income Tax Act, 1963.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is brought here as a result of a printing error which occurred when the Bill to fix the Rate of Income Tax was last before the Legislature. The Objects and Reasons disclose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that leave has been granted the Hon. Minister to proceed with this Bill in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I thank you, Sir. The amount of taxable income which is subject to income tax at the rate of 6% is set out in the Schedule to the Rates of Income Tax Act, 1963, as $1,000 instead of $500. This error has to be corrected, and the Bill before the Legislature is for the purpose of correcting the error.

There is no other explanation, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of a Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 13 be the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to Order No. 13, but it seems difficult for me to understand what is the intention of the Hon. Leader of the House. Last week, Tuesday, when we adjourned, he referred to the Order Paper and spoke along the lines in which he would like things done. Today, he is jumping about like a little boy playing a game of hop-scotch. He told the House quite solemnly last Tuesday that he wanted to get through the Bills dealing with industrial matters. He dealt with Order No. 5, then Order No. 14 and left out Order No. 8; he even went down to Order No. 18.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the fixed Order Paper, the Items remain as before. I am merely trying to take advantage of the Hon. Premier's presence to dispose of a number of matters standing in his name. I am dealing with a matter that is uncontroversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of Order No. 13, I am seeking information from the Acting Clerk as to whether this Bill has appeared in the Official Gazette.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Order No. 13, is a Resolution Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case, the Hon. Minister of Communications, may proceed.

Order No. 13 is a Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to amend a certain condition in the lease of a parcel of land at Cheapside to the Caribbean Development Company Limited, approved by Resolution No. 39/1961, to allow the construction of supporting columns to a building situated thereon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this is the Resolution to amend a certain condition in the lease of a parcel of land at Cheapside to the Caribbean Development Company Limited, approved by Resolution No. 39/1961, to allow the construction of supporting columns to a building thereon.
5.35 p.m.

On the 2nd August, 1961, it was agreed to lease a parcel of land at Cheapside to the Caribbean Development Company Ltd., and the terms and conditions were that no erection were to be placed on that land. Since then the occupants require columns to be placed to support an arcade. These columns will in no way interfere with the public's free right in passing along the road on the south side of the entrance to the Cheapside market. As it is stated in the Addendum it is felt that the supporting columns of the arcade will not constitute a significant obstruction, and the covered pavement will remain a public right of way in accordance with the terms of the lease.

I think this arcade would greatly improve the appearance along this highway as well as form a shelter for people who are passing in and out of the market.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister just one question. Can he tell me exactly where this place is?

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister rises, let me find out if there is anything else which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas wants to contribute.

Mr. BOXILL: No, Sir.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: For the information of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, this place is on the southern side of Cheapside near to the market. The Caribbean Development Company will be constructing an arcade with supporting columns to a cantilever leading to the market.

Mr. BOXILL: I thank you.

The question that the Resolution be now passed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 11 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1963."

Hon E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, The Civil Establishment Order No. 7 which we have before us now is a relatively simple one. It calls for the re-organization and re-grading of certain posts in the Audit Department, the office of the Premier and the Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries.

The posts of Permanent Secretary to the Premier and Cabinet Secretary is to be re-graded from a salary of $9,720 per annum to $9,480. I think it was as a result of the Godsall Report that this Permanent Secretary with Cabinet duties attached was awarded an increase of salary over the other Permanent Secretaries. I am not too sure, but under the Jacobs' Report the holder was awarded a salary of £150 more. I think I should say that this re-grading is no down-grading to anyone so now the Permanent Secretary to the Premier and Cabinet Secretary will be on the same footing as that of the other Permanent Secretaries to the other Ministries.

When the re-grading of that salary was contemplated certain officers of the Civil Service objected especially where the salary was concerned, and the quarrel was invoked by senior officers. However, I do not think there is any cause now for any of those officers who are eligible for any objection to the salary being put back. It is not a question of re-grading. This is the result of representations by the persons most likely to be affected whenever the past holder of the post was promoted as he had been promoted. I may say with all due deference to all the senior members in the Civil Service, no one can dispute that the holder of that post was entitled to the salary which he received, but it is felt now that the time has come when the position can be rationalised and the discrepancies removed between the salary which other Permanent Secretaries receive and the salary of the Permanent Secretary and the Cabinet, a post which is regarded the same as a Permanent Secretary under the Civil Establishment Order. It is desirable that we should do those things which should have been done a long time ago.

In the Audit Department there will be the creation of the following posts: 2 Examiners at $3,096 — 3,960; 2 Long Grade Clerks at $1,200 — 2,832; 1 Stenographer at $1,260 — 1,728 or $1,440 — 2,352; under the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries there will be a change in title of the post of Inspector of Friendly Societies to that of Co-operative Officer, and the creation of an additional post of Co-operative Officer at a salary of $3,096 — 3,960.

I do not think there is anything else which needs explaining therefore I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO.6) ORDER, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 10 be the next Order of the day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1963".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr Speaker, continuous exercises are going on since this Government is adding on more Government Departments with the idea of promoting more efficiency and streamlining accounting procedures and other procedures in the offices in order to give better and higher standards to the general public and to reduce the cost of these departments as far as possible to the taxpayers of the Island. The series of Civil Establishment Orders which I have introduced today to which the House has agreed are really part of these continuous exercises which were going on all the time.

This is no fanatic motion introduced in the Public Service of the Island; it is something with which we are much concerned, such as the efficiency of the Departments, the type of department per capital and the work of the department in relation to the amount of money spent in those departments.
5.45 p.m.

The Department of Government which is next to the Public Works Department, which spends the greatest amount of money is the Department of Highways and Transport, and the Adviser on Establishment, Organization and Training has spent a great deal of time in giving a very close look at the organization and staff of this Department. The Order which we now have before us, Mr. Speaker, is one which the Government is recommending to the House as a result of the recommendations of the Adviser on Establishment, Organization and Training. This Officer is now in the process of doing a similar job in the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing, with a view to the amalgamation of the Works Department in the Ministry in the same manner as we have re-organized the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and the Ministry of Education.

The posts in the Order are fully set out. You will see that over all it means an increase of only one, from the number 24 to the number 25 in those grades where the reorganization has been recommended. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

UNLICENSED FIREARMS (SURRENDER AND EXEMPTION FROM PENALTIES) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to exempt from penalties under the Firearms Act, 1896 persons who, within a specified period, surrender unlicensed firearms to the Commissioner of Police.

In the event of this Bill not being gazetted, will the Hon. Leader of the House make a motion for the suspension of Standing Order 40 (1) so as to regularise the position?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 40 (1)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Very well, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Order 40 (1) be now suspended.

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

The question that Standing Order 40 (1) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The purpose of that motion is to enable that Bill to be read a second time even if it has not been printed and circulated to hon. members and even if it does not appear in the *Official Gazette.*

Hon E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to remind hon. members that during the course of the Budget Speech last year I said that the Government proposed to increase the amount of licence on fire-arms and then, arising out of that decision which took place this year, the Government said that it would consider introducing legislation to give an amnesty to those persons who were in possession of unlicensed fire arms. We also introduced a Bill earlier this year to increase the penalties for the possession of unlicensed firearms and other kindred offences. The idea of the amnesty was that since the fine is much more severe for being in possession of unlicensed firearms than it was before, persons who took the risk of being illegally in possession of such firearms should take advantage of the position and would undertake to deliver up their firearms to the police without fear of any penalty and in appropriate cases to apply to the Commissioner of Police for a licence to hold or keep or carry a firearm. I therefore think that all hon. members of the public who may be in possession of unlicensed firearms should have the position regularised just as what is done in the case of dog licences. It is an extremely dangerous thing for people to throw away or bury firearms because they may be dug up by children with greater consequences. The whole object of the Government in introducing this Bill today is to discourage people from burying or throwing away firearms and invite them to give them up to the police and if necessary apply to the police for licences to keep these firearms.
5.55 p.m.

The only people who are unlikely or who may be reluctant to do so will be the people who are in possession of stolen firearms. We are not exempting anyone who has stolen a gun from the consequences of the Larcency Act, but we will exempt a person who either has been in the possession of a firearm for a very long time and has never bothered to licence it, or who was in charge of a firearm which would give rise to suspicion.

People who have purchased firearms from overseas, for instance, should take advantage of the amnesty. A lot of workers have returned from America, Aruba, Curacao as well as seamen — I am not looking at any member in this House at this stage — with firearms. Any person who may have legitimately purchased firearms overseas and brought them into Barbados should take the opportunity to surrender them to the Police and apply for a licence for the firearms, in which event the police will re-issue the firearm on payment of the proper fee for the issue of a licence.

If a person who has lawfully acquired a firearm and kept it in his possession, or inherited one by finding it in his house where he is living, it is his duty as a citizen to deliver it to the Police and apply for a licence. After the period of this amnesty has expired the full weight of the law will be visited upon all those who do not take advantage of the facility which the Government has given them. I have given you the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, and I hope that all well-thinking citizens who have brought firearms into Barbados, or who have acquired one in the past, will take advantage of the amnesty. The price of a licence is only $10.00, and they can escape the rigour of the law which will fall upon them by taking advantage of this amnesty.

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

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

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not against this Bill, but I feel that the law as it stands is very stupidly drawn out. Take, for instance, a man applies for a licence for a firearm, and in the Commissioner's opinion the man is not eligible to hold a licence for a gun. The man is not issued with a licence to keep the gun, but he can join the Barbados Rifle Association and get a licence to operate a big gun instead of a small revolver.

I have absolutely nothing against this Bill, because I am not a gun-toting cavalier. I am just trying to show the stupid thing that is being done. The Premier did not make this law, but he is amending the law. You cannot get a licence for a little revolver that might only bruise somebody's skin, but you are allowed to get a licence for a

cannon so long as you are a member of the Barbados Rifle Association.

I would like to ask the Hon. Premier this question: If a man finds a gun and takes it to the Commissioner of Police, what is to prevent the police from charging him? You can come into possession of a gun through somebody hiding it in your house. If you take a gun to the police in August or some other month, what is the position of the person who takes in the gun? I would like the Hon. Premier to answer that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was felt that the Bill which was recently passed here had imposed a very heavy fine on people in possession of unlicensed guns, and that it would have put a scare on people who would have been honest enough to surrender their guns. I appreciate what this Bill proposes to do because it gives an opportunity to people who have unlicensed guns — and there must be quite a number of people with guns who have not bothered to get a licence for them, as you are aware, Mr. Speaker — to surrender them and obtain licences. This Bill gives them an opportunity to surrender the guns without any fear of being prosecuted. I think it is a very magnanimous gesture on the part of the Government. This Bill gives an opportunity to everybody who wants to be a law-abiding citizen to surrender a gun and obtain a licence for it.

I do not believe that law applies necessarily to people in the lower walks of life. There are people in the higher walks of life who cannot control their tempers. I know people who can afford to buy guns, but they could not keep guns because of their bad tempers. Some people will use a gun at the slightest provocation, as Your Honour is aware. I feel that this Bill should be given the widest publicity, and that is what everyone of us would desire.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has asked the question: What would happen if a man goes to the Police with a gun in August or September? He wants to know whether the man would be liable to prosecution for the unlawful possession of a gun. I do not think that would arise in the present state of the law in this Colony. If a man finds a gun in circumstances where the owner cannot be traced or is unlikely to be discovered, then legislation affords him an opportunity to come forward with the gun regardless of how long he had it in his possession.

For the hon. member to stand up and say that this is stupid legislation because somebody can join the Barbados Rifle Association and use a gun, and yet that person may have been refused a licence by the Commissioner of Police, is not really a logical way of presenting an argument against the Bill. If the hon. member knew of any case which has arisen in the past, then it would not be in relation to the amnesty which was passed.
6.05 p.m.

This is a very, very serious matter. What I was saying before I was interrupted was that this is a very serious matter and the new penalties which have been imposed by the Legislature are very much more severe than previously. Therefore, this Bill is giving to those people who are unaware of the penalties the opportunity of coming forward and.....

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am in the middle of a sentence. Can the hon. member rise on a point of order, when I am in the middle of a sentence?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear the point of order.

Mr. BOXILL: The Hon. Premier misinterpreted what I said or he did not understand. What I said was this. A man belongs to the B.R.A. and he is refused a licence to keep a firearm. I am not talking of a person who wants to keep a gun or who does not want to keep a gun.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have already disposed of that point. I said relative to the Bill which we are now discussing that a man who has a gun in the Armoury and shoots with it once a week at the Garrison is a different thing. By virtue of the fact that the man is a marksman, it would be dangerous to grant him a licence for the keeping of a firearm. Because you belong to the B.R.A., it does not qualify you to keep a revolver.

Quite honestly, if there were no unlicensed guns in Barbados we could sort of ban guns in this Island altogether, but we have to allow people who have properties to protect stores and that kind of thing, to keep firearms because there are so many unlicensed guns. If there were no unlicensed guns, we would be prepared to impose a ban right now.

The hon. member said that he does not appreciate the person who drafted this piece of legislation. Let me say that before any bit of legislation comes to this House that I would have to approve of it. What I was demonstrating to the hon. member was for him to get up unfortunately and think of the most obtuse kind of illustration, the most outrageous eventuality and say that the Bill is nonsensical and that it is not known to happen in the Island is something which I cannot appreciate. He is saying, "suppose so and so happens." When I was at school they used to say: "Suppose I had no nose." To come in and say that this is stupid because it does not provide for a man who belongs to the Rifle Association being allowed to get a licence to keep a firearm is something which I cannot appreciate. There is nothing about keeping anything in this Bill. The hon. member cannot understand what I am saying.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not criticising this Resolution because in my opinion, this is one of the best Bills introduced in this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How can that be a point of order? The hon. member has not spoken yet and he has risen on a point of order.

Mr. SEALEY: I feel this is the best piece of legislation which has come to the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I really cannot understand. I want to tell the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that he said that this was stupid legislation. No legislation, especially that which stands in my name, comes to this House unless I have scrutinized and gone through it with care; therefore, to suggest that this is stupid legislation because it is possible for somebody who belongs to the Rifle Association to be refused being granted a licence by the Commissioner of Police, let me tell him that the Commissioner of Police acting in his discretion can refuse the Officer Administering the Government a licence.

This is legislation to help a lot of people, like merchant seamen who have brought in firearms and people who have purchased them illegitimately and have not got around to licensing them. Most of the firearms have got to come through the Port and we all know that there are merchant seamen and people like that who bring them in illegitimately. Most of the unlicensed firearms come in here by merchant seamen and instead of acknowledging this fact, the hon. member gets up and says that this is stupid legislation because a member of the Rifle Association is refused a licence by the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. First of all, I would like to draw to your attention and I want to make it explicitly clear to members of the Gallery.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You may not draw my attention to that because if you draw my attention to that, the Gallery will have to be cleared.

Mr. BOXILL: The Hon. Premier said that I know full well that merchant seamen bring in firearms illegitimately. Do you know for truth? I do not know of merchant seamen bringing in firearms but, may be, he has brought in; I do not know.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: All of these remarks are completely unworthy of members of this House. I have never

been a merchant seaman; I would not say that I would not like to be a merchant seaman because some of them work for a lot of money. I do not think I should say anything more.

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

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

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one of the best pieces of legislation which has been brought to the House of Assembly for a long time. We have a lot of stray guns in the hands of people and I feel that this is a splendid opportunity for these people to come forward and surrender their guns to the Commissioner of Police, and then get a licence. As far as I can see, if you have a Mark 7 gun, you cannot get a licence. I have never heard of that. Those guns are the property of the State.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, these are supposed to be the property of the State you cannot get a licence to carry one of these guns. I do hope that this information will be circulated around the island so that people will make use of it.

The question that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 2 and 3 were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas during the second reading of this Bill, made a point about the members of the Barbados Rifle Association having licences to carry guns and use them and they cannot get licences for private guns. Clause 3 of the Firearms Act says this:-

"Except as hereinafter appears, no person shall have, use, or carry a gun in this Island unless and until he has in the manner hereinafter provided, obtained a licence to have, use or carry such a gun. Any person who infringes the provisions of this section shall be liable to a penalty of one pound to be recovered in a summary manner before a Police Magistrate on the complaint of any person, and to be paid into the Public Treasury to the credit of the general revenue.

Provided always, that the said penalty shall not be incurred by the following persons, namely, -

(a) any person in the naval or military service of His Majesty, or in the Police Force of this Island, having, using, or carrying any gun in the performance of his duty, or when engaged in target practice;

(b) any person carrying a gun belonging to a person having in force a licence under this Act....."

Mr. Chairman, if that person applies to the Commissioner of Police for a private gun he is just like any other citizen.

Mr. BOXILL: The Hon. Premier has not answered what I have asked him; he has a way of deviating from what has been asked.

The CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. BOXILL: I am addressing you, Mr. Chairman, I heard people deviating and I did not hear any gavel being knocked.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was not in the Chair. *(ASIDES).*

Mr. BOXILL: That is my business. What I want to know from the Hon. Premier is what happens to a man who submits a gun to the Commissioner of Police after this amnesty has been passed?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member talks all the time and does not listen when I am replying, he will go on to say that I have not answered the question. This is what happens every day. You find a book and you take it to the police; you find a gun and you can take it to the Police. Are you subject to a penalty for doing that?

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

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

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

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

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 16 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has for its object the clearing up of some anomalies which exist in the Pensions Act, 1947. In the first instance, it makes provision for safeguarding the pension rights of officers who were transferred from service with the West Indies Federation to service with the Interim Commissioner for the West Indies on the dissolution of the Federation. It also seeks to replace regulations six and thirteen, which deal with marriage gratuities for female officers, by revised regulations which have been recommended by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in place of the old regulations which may give rise to anomalous and inequitable rewards in certain cases. In the third place, the Bill seeks to correct certain minor errors which resulted from recent amendments to Regulations 19 and 22. Finally, the Bill seeks to make the necessary provision for facilitating the transfer of local Government Officers to the Central Government Service without loss of pension rights. Those are the Objects and Reasons of this Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased if the Hon. Premier will explain a paragraph on page five for me.

Mr SPEAKER: Perhaps that particular paragraph might be effectively dealt with in Committee. You can proceed with your general comments.

Mr WEEKES: I have no comments to make; I just want to have a certain paragraph cleared up, Sir.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive, were called separately and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (EXPORT INDUSTRIES) BILL, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that Order No. 7 be now taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the grant of concessions in relation to income tax, trade tax, the fees chargeable under the provision of the Interim Traders Act, 1909 for an interim traders licence, customs duties and package tax in aid of industries producing exclusively for export and for other matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the provisions in this Bill will assist the Government in its efforts to provide further industrial development in this Island. You will note, Sir, that the Bill has been designed to provide special concessions for industries manufacturing mainly for export. The population of this Island being what it is, Sir, and even the population of the adjacent Islands being as limited as it is, it is manifestly impossible to attract industries of a certain type unless these industries can cater to a market much bigger than what this Island and the adjacent Islands can afford. Therefore, we are aiming our targets at attracting industries in the Island which would manufacture for larger markets in Europe and North America.

This Bill is designed specifically to provide for large industrial concerns and to encourage them to site their factories in this Island. The Bill is divided into four parts. Part 1 generalises on matters appertaining to the power of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to declare approved export products; the declaration of approved export manufacturers; applications for approval and so on.

It is proposed that power be given to the Governor-in Executive Committee to declare that the product or manufacturer shall be approved as an export product or export manufacturer for the purpose of the Bill. The product first and foremost has to be approved as an export product.

It is also proposed that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have the power to declare that a Company which is manufacturing or the manufacturer of an approved export product shall be declared an approved export manufacturer for the purpose of the Bill.

In order to encourage investors to act quickly, it is proposed that no product or manufacturer should be approved as an export product or an export manufacturer as the case may be after 31st December, 1966 — roughly three and a half years from now. If there is a time limit put upon the period to which these provisions apply, it is to be hoped that people, in order to take advantage of them, will make the necessary application before December, 1966.
6.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact in the first part of the Bill it is stated: "It is also proposed that companies which have already been declared to be pioneer manufacturers under existing pioneer industries legislation should be disqualified from obtaining the status of approved export manufacturers." In other words, if you are already a pioneer manufacturer and have already been given concessions under the existing legislation you cannot now be accorded the concession in this special legislation.

Well now, Part II of the Bill deals with income tax and it is proposed that during the period of ten years "commencing on the date of production specified in the order declaring a company to be an approved export manufacturer all profits or gains arising or accruing to such approved export manufacturer from the manfacturer or sale of his approved export product should be exempt from income tax.' That is to say, ten years after the commencement of the production date, you would have income tax exemption. Under the normal Pioneer Industries legislation, the tax exemption is for a period of seven years, but in order to attract manufacturers for a larger market, we are extending the period from seven years to ten years and after the expiration of seven years they will only pay income tax at the rate of 12 1/2 per cent.

These incentives, Sir, are designed as I have said earlier, specifically to attract large industrial concerns and if you want to get them here, naturally you have to lean over backwards to provide the sort of concessions not only that which they can get elsewhere, but which is conducive enough to attract them to site their business here.

Part II goes on to deal with other provisions with regard to annual allowances, balancing allowances, dividends on shares and what not.

Part III of the Bill relates to trade, customs duty, and package tax, and we are exempting them from all the provisions already existing in our pioneer industry legislation, except in this instance that they are also exempted from package tax.

The Fourth Part deals with miscellaneous matters like relief from company registration fees, the control of approved export manufacturers by the Comptroller, restrictions on the sale of approved export products in Barbados and certain other territories, the revocation of orders and the making of regulations.

As I have said earlier, we are not singular in this type of legislation. As a matter of fact, Jamaica which also has legislation of this sort has now gone further and it is proposed in Jamaica to grant even further concessions to industries manufacturing materials for export. In the legislation now being drafted in Jamaica, in addition to these incentives which we are now going to give ourselves, further tax rebates are being offered and Jamaica is also preparing to abolish estate duty in the industrial and agricultural sections in order to attract overseas investors.

Generally speaking, the whole basis of this Government's industrial programme is to provide jobs for the

people and to elevate their living standards. We told the public at the last General Elections that we were approaching this question of economic development in three directions: (1) The diversification of agriculture; (2) extending the tourist trade; and (3) the expansion of industrial development.

I am pleased to be able to say that Government's industrial programme is off to a reasonably good start and we have no less than 20 or 25 applications for pioneer legislation, the greater part of which has already been processed and within the period which we specified for laying the foundation for the commencement of industrial programme in Barbados. I am happy to say that at the expiration of that period our pledges would have been maintained.

I have no doubt, Sir, that with the proper promotion of publicity the new proposals which Government is prepared to offer under this Bill manufacturers of the type whom we have in mind will be attracted to the Colony. Of course we have to bear in mind that while we are doing this there are countries outside and inside of the area offering the same and even more concessions with this same purpose in view. They are doing this sort of thing in the U.S.A., Canada, Great Britain, and other parts of Europe, and the Italian Government is offering all sorts of concessions in order to industrialize rural areas in Italy.
6.45 p.m.

Even Jamaica also has a new programme, a new principle which is very far reaching so as to attract industrialisation in the rural areas in that island. We have to realise that the main circumstances which are likely to attract manufacturers to this country are the availability of labour at reasonable wage rates, an industrial climate sponsored by the Government to provide similar concessions to those obtainable elsewhere and a ready accessibility of export markets. The rapid industrial development of Puerto Rico was conditioned mainly by these three factors — a plentiful supply of labour, an industrial climate fostered by the Government, ready transport facilities for sending the finished product from Puerto Rico to the mainland and lastly there is the existence of a reasonably harmonious relationship between employers and employees in the community.

We find that in this island relations between capital and labour are very harmonious. That is not to say that there is not any leeway to be made up of difficulties put into the way in which they are in other places in the world. One of the things which the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Programme has taught us is the fact that our wage rates are at the moment somewhat lower than the highly industrial places as a source of attraction. Nobody is suggesting or even condoning the maintenance of any unreasonably low wage level. We have to bear in mind our large population many of whom have no work to do and with little hope of getting a job, and before we can talk of getting the same wage standards as in the highly industrialised places, we first have to get proper wage standards. That is not to say that we will allow people to come in here and exploit our people; reasonable wage rates will at least enable us to have an industrial programme and ensure that industries would be established in the island which would provide work for large numbers of the unemployed at reasonable standards of existence. I am reasonably sure, Mr. Speaker, that all sections of the community will make the maximum possible contribution towards assisting the Government in bringing this programme to a successful conclusion.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that one would expect me to say something especially having regard to the closing remarks of the Hon. Minister in which he offered this challenge to me. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: There is no challenge.) I am not underwriting any question of low wages.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. If the hon. member thinks that anything I said constitutes a challenge to him, I should like first and foremost to disillusion him of any such intention; I was merely representing the situation as I saw it and explaining what I feel. It was no challenge to the hon. member neither was I asking him to underwrite any low wages.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not a point of order. That is the hon. member's opinion. If I accept that as a challenge, there is no point of order involved. I am free, in a free society, to say whatever I feel pleased to say. I say that I am not agreeing to underwriting any low wages as a means of attracting industries.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The implication is to say that I have asked the hon. member to underwrite low wages in industrialisation.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have not said so. I said that I am not going to agree to underwriting low wages in any industrialisation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Neither do we.

Mr. WALCOTT: Your Government is not the first Government to have an industrial programme. I have assisted in promoting a programme of industrial development. Economic development is nothing new nor is it out of date. Professor Arthur Lewis, the former principal of the University of the West Indies, wrote an example of industrial development and do you mean to say that people are so blind that they cannot read it?
6.55 p.m.

I am not interested in power like other people over there. I am not going to say that had it not been for me, there would not have been development in this country. I am not going to say that had I not been in power, certain people would not get jobs. I can only say that had there not been an organisation like the one over which I have control there would not have been this type of climate for people to work in. It is not a question of getting power, but it is due to a sense of responsibility on the part of the Trade Union to create an industrial climate where people can come and invest their money. This is not a place where you have a strike on the flimsiest pretext. This is the type of atmosphere that must be created.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the three Orders that we have dealt with (Orders Nos. 7, 8 and 9) you will see that we can bring these things together. I will not make a speech on Orders Nos. 7, 8 and 9. The Hon. Premier gets touchy when I have to say something against the Government, but he need not get touchy with me, because I agree with this matter. When I write you off, I write you off forever. The hon. member need not think that I am against this. As far as I am concerned, I want the hon. member to understand that if the Government brings legislation with which I agree I will vote for it. I do not ask any favours. I am not interested in knowing what the Government is doing or is not doing, but I am interested in knowing that when legislation comes here, I can agree with it.

When I say that I am finished with a man, woman or child, I am really finished with him or her. I do not suffer from the spite which some of these members suffer from. In his closing remarks, the hon. member spoke about wage rates and mentioned that it was one of the things that will attract people to come here and invest money. He does not expect these territories to be in competition with other industrial territories. He cannot speak with two tongues. He said that the people in Barbados must do something regarding the learning of skills because without skills they do not have any bargaining power as against professionals. I want to say that our market is not always going to be an unskilled, cheap, labour market. Cheap labour will not always be here. What I am prepared to say is that these days are not like the old days. I am not merely interested in attracting industries; I am willing to attract industries that will enhance the economic position of this Island.

You will find a lot of people walking about here looking for industrial development who have run from the Southern States of America, and they have no reputation. Some of

them are in these areas to exploit the people of these Islands. What I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier is that in all of these Bills — I know that the Minister will have more power today than anybody else has ever had in the past. It is good for a Minister to have a lot of power

What I expected the Minister to say today — they had to do it in Jamaica. People have been coming into this area and ignoring the Trade Unions, and there has been a movement in this Government to indicate that the members of of the Government are willing to go bargaining with the employers who are ignoring the Trade Unions. I had to bring one of them to his senses a long time ago, because he wanted to act contrary to established Trade Union principles. I told somebody some time ago that they will have to come down and do certain things themselves. I am one of those people who will be in the front line. I do not have to get any fifth columnist or a good friend or displaced people to do anybody anything. That is why I say that some people are criminals, because they will get people to do criminal acts when they themselves will withdraw from the scene.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member should be speaking on the Resolution. Is the hon. member suggesting that somebody on this side of the House is asking people to go around and criticise him or do something to him? It would be better if he would make a direct statement instead of saying these things and preventing himself from making a valuable contribution to the debate. If he is making aspersions to other members of the House, I will be very grateful for information. It is a serious accusation against other members of the Government. First, that we are undermining him, and second that we are telling foreign investors to ignore trade unionists.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a lawyer, and he can take me to Court. The Court is always there to vindicate anybody's cause.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member continue with his comments on the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am talking about the Bill. What do you think I am talking about?
7.05 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not like him to shelter beyond the privileges of Parliament; I would like him to be specific. He said "yes" and if he is suggesting that any of my colleagues or I try to suborn any person or persons unknown I would be very grateful if he took the opportunity and enlighten me on this. It is not right to throw out that in his agitated way. I have already said that there are people who would destroy a person first in order to destroy this Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I have lived long enough to know who would destroy me. I have lived long enough to answer questions. Yes, some members of your Government indulge in practices which operate against the very thing which you should be secret on. They operate against good industrial relations of this Island. I went to Sawmills. You ask them where they got them from and they said they got them from the Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to know why the hon. member is accusing this Government Tuesday after Tuesday for things which I know nothing about. The hon. member knows my telephone number, where my office is and where I live. Why not come and make direct communication with me? It is not fair for him to get up in the course of a debate and throw out all these references.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order submitted to me for decision?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said that I gave the sawmill company permission to circumvent.

Mr. WALCOTT: Did I say you?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I thought that you said it was I.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said a Minister because I was told so when the thing took place. What is the use of the Hon. Premier telling me that I have to be specific] I am specific. I am not stating a case that has no relevance to the matter. The sawmill company has been given pioneer status, therefore I am specific. I was drawing to your attention a problem which arose in which the sawmill company was operating in a way which was unusual and when this thing was brought to the fore, it was said that the Minister had given them the authority to do so. I am giving them this as one instance.

The Hon. Premier said that instead of making these abuses on the floor of the House, to come to him and tell him about it. I have done enough of this on matters which I felt should be drawn to the head of the Government. I am surprised to hear that I am wasting the time of the House. I have no time to waste in carrying these matters to the Head of the Government again. When I go to the head of the Government with these matters, far from the head of the Government respecting what I told him, he goes on a public platform and makes statements about your *bona fides*.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has this anything to do with the Resolution?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. I would like to know when I challenged the hon. member about *bona fides*. The hon. member has made use of certain statements which I very much deprecate to which I ask him to be specific instead of casting slurs on the floor of the House or that he come to my private residence or office and tell me about them.

The hon. member said that I made certain accusations about him. All that I said on public platforms was that there are a lot of people going to the hon. member and fulling his head with a lot of misinformation. What he has said today, convinces me of the truth of such statements. I am asking him which Minister is preventing his Union from doing something and who gave him all of this advice because he has been coming in here and has all the members of this Government for the past two months completely unhappy about things happening in this House of Assembly and it has come out just like a tortoise from his shell that what is mostly troubling him is that somebody is going to him an giving him a lot of wrong information. It is very difficult for me to diagnose what the trouble is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Premier making that a subject on the Resolution? The hon. member used the phrase "on a point of order." It may be worthy of consideration whether a short adjournment at this stage would not be necessary to the staff even if we do not consider ourselves.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to answer that point which was made by the Hon. Premier because he allocates to speak not only for himself but also for others. I would like to know how he would know I have been misinformed based on what I have said today. It is one of those stupid things. You cannot know if anybody told me. I am saying that this is a public matter; this is nobody telling me anything. This is something which has come up in negotiations. We were told to stop a ship unloading cargo in a certain manner. That is something which we said that we did not agree to, and when we went to the crew we were told that a Minister said that it could be done in that way.

The Hon. Premier needs advice and a lot of people to come around him. I have lived long enough to know that there is nobody who can be such an adviser to me that can cause me to do the thing which I do not want to do. I suffer from none of those things.

The point which I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no disagreement with me with the Bill which is being proposed by the Hon. Minister. I am in agreement with the incentives offered and that you would have to create further inducements. I go further and say that in a little country like this, you can debar the introduction of industrial development by creating a scheme in which

you make a new investor feel that the area is different and you offer them different opportunities. The fact is that we happen to have a lower wage rate than many of those other countries and you are offering them added attractions. I do know that in my own organisation, sometimes we forego the pressures which we would make on some industries because they are new and so as to allow them time to catch their feet and to establish themselves we give up our rights.

What I was dealing with was the closing remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House when he made a statement in a general way — not in a specific way — about reasonable wage rates and from that I said that I accepted that as a challenge. I did not mean that in the way as how the Hon. Minister thought I meant. He spoke as though I meant that he was proposing a low wage rate and I was opposed to that. What I would say is that Mr. Will Isaacs of Jamaica had to come out with a positive statement saying that the people who were in the trade were ignoring the Trade Union movement in Jamaica and that he was going to remove the incentives. That is one of the things which Mr. Will Isaacs had to say.
7.15 p.m.

I would like to say this in a general way. The hon. member spoke about the Government's policy in encouraging industrial development and that is something with which all of us will agree. What I would like to say is that I feel the time has come when the Government's attention should be drawn to the fact that the army of people available for work should be better utilised in order to meet the demands for any industrial expansion programme. My view is that Barbados should make greater use of the human resources which are available today and do not allow them to remain as they are. As a projection for the future, I think you should use this army of people and have them trained as a prerequisite to what the country is spending and utilise them for industrial development so that your entrepeneurs would not come here and say that this is an area where there are all skills but it is full of unskilled labour. All of your new industries must have somewhere to operate. One of the things which is lacking in Barbados is this: The Government is building the East Coast Road and most of the development in the next ten or fifteen years is going to revolve around construction and we want a skilled reservoir of people in the same way as we have preparation for defence. You want to have this army of people utilised because it fits in so far as you can utilise it.

When you have people for this type of job they will not accept wages as unskilled men and women. I know that the other Government has agreed that emigration cannot be the answer to the problems because if that were so what would you do about Ireland. Today Ireland is still worse off although you have so many of the people out of the country. You cannot underwrite your climate as being a low wage climate. You have to make sure that your area can provide schools so that you can increase the gross national product of your country, and that those who look for new jobs can get them. The Government can be interested in the belief that you are giving these concessions not on the basis of your local commitments to the people of Barbados but on the basis of other commitments. The people in the garment industry have been noted for getting incentives from countries and they bring up a lot of second-hand machinery for somebody locally to buy, and after they have withdrawn all their profits, they leave. You read about these things; you read about other industrial development, and about the plan for France. Is not the hon. member aware of the vast Tennessee Valley Scheme?

As to the question of development and planning, that is something with which everybody agrees; but in our community we have to watch what we are allowing in our midst with entrepreneurs coming in, and they should say what they expect to do. It is only today that I was talking with a person who has established a pioneer industry and I told him my views with which he agreed. On examination of the type of machinery which he is putting down, I would say that when a man buys new machinery to be utilised in a business, you know that he is not making any fun; but when he comes along and buys bits and ends of machinery, that is a different enterprise from the one where a man is brining in a lot of machinery.

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have to be interested in seeing that in our efforts even for industrial development, we do not encourage people to take us for a ride. Because other people are offering these things we should see that we just do not go on and take them. Owing to the geographical position of Barbados we have to see after ourselves first. I have been in public life long enough to know that the greatest respect you command from anybody in the world is when you start off from your home base. As I said earlier, this is a community in which you have to learn people to save.
7.25 p.m.

I say that you will have to create a class of ownership among the people of Barbados. You must make Barbadians feel that they have a right to own something. All I am asking you to do is to explain this as far as possible within your own community. You must not only help entrepreneurs who are coming here from outside I would like to see the Government introducing a plan similar to the one they have in Germany — the hon. member was in Germany. You should encourage people to build houses in a certain place and private people will invest money in the community in which they live. If you can get men who are working for $13 or $40 a week to have the feeling that when they invest in something the Government will give them an incentive, you would get better results. They are so many thousand houses to be built that the Government will never be able to build all of these houses for the people.

Why I say these things is because I would like the Government to realise that other members of the House are also thinking about the needs of the people in the community. We, too, have the welfare of the people at heart. We cannot sit here and believe that the members of the Government have all the knowledge — they do not have the money to do these things. The money is in the hands of the people, and you have to get some of them to release some of the money. You have to stop things like gambling. Too much money is invested in gambling and there is no certain return.

I am sure that any hon. member, speaking on this matter, will realise that you do not need this. What I do not understand is that each time I speak here, either the Leader of the House or the Hon. Premier seems to have the idea that my speech must be based on their approbation. If I require the approbation of any person to come here and speak, I would not come at all. The moment I say something against the Government, the exploitation of the point of order is used. If I do not agree with what the Hon. Minister says, I do not see why any point of order should be raised.

Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders have been suspended, and it is within the province of any member to move the adjournment. It is not vouchsafe or open to the Government to do it — anybody can do it. If you do not want to continue with this debate .....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not saying that.

Mr. WALCOTT: If it is your intention to have the debate on this matter postponed, I will agree with that. I will move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION FOR $3,372

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad if hon. members will agree to take this Resolution which was circulated today, because some urgency is attached to it. We would prefer to take the Resolution and then adjourn for good.

I am, therefore, asking for leave, at this stage, to deal in all its stages with the Resolution of which notice was

given today. The Resolution has already been circulated to members.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

"Resolved that the sum of three thousand three hundred and seventy-two dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1963-64 No. 6 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

Mr SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking for permission to deal instantly with the Resolution of which he gave notice today and, I understand, it has been circulated to every member. He assures this House that it is a matter of great urgency. *(Pause).*

There being no objection, the Hon. Minister may proceed.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 No. 6

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of $3,372, is for the purpose set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

The sum of $1,872 is required to meet the payment of personal allowances at $168 per annum and $144 per annum, previously agreed on for those male and female Grade 1 Headteachers respectively who were adversely affected by the 1961 Salaries Revision. Provision of funds was inadvertently omitted in the Estimates 1963-64.

The sum of $1,500 is required to meet the cost of an additional respirator which is urgently needed at the Hospital for use in connection with cases of poliomyelitis involving paralysis of the respiratory muscles.

I beg to move that Head 36 — Ministry of Education (5) Schools, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to say something about this matter, but the Minister of Education is not in his seat. There has been a letter which has been circularised to elementary teachers especially dealing with leave passages and there has been some misunderstanding. I cannot go into the matter now, but I would like the Minister of Education to make a check and go carefully into this matter. 7.35 p.m.

It is not accurate, and there is a great misunderstanding amongst teachers who receive a certain salary and then say they have now been told. It is quite contrary to the notice which they have received. I do not want to say much on it, because the Hon. Minister of Education is not now in his place, but I hope the Hon. Leader of the House would draw what I have said to his attention.

The question that Head 36 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 — MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head 39 (2) — Medical — General Hospital was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the sum of $1,500 is required to meet the cost of an additional respirator and it is certainly needed for the General Hospital because of cases of poliomyelitis. We have on supply one of these respirators and we want another one immediately.

I beg to move that Head 39 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: How many of these respirators have you at the Hospital?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This would make four.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, without engaging in any propoganda I just want to say this. I am sure the Hon. Minister cannot change the law, therefore I am supporting him in many respects because it is part of my business to know how many cases of poliomyelitis there are. I can tell him how many if he cannot tell me. The law says that poliomyelitis must be reported, therefore all I am saying to you is this. Under the circumstances, instead of coming here for $1,500, you should be coming here for $6,000. I do not want to hear any argument. I had to sit only today with your highest authority on this matter. They are criticizing you. I say in the interest of conditions as they are prevailing at the moment that you better come here for money to buy four more because there is no point in coming for just one when in truth and in fact what we are faced with will really take three or four more.

Mr. SMITH: Before the Hon. Minister replies I would like to know from him how many cases of poliomyelitis have we? How many are reported at the Hospital up to today?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer the suggestion put by the hon. senior member for the City first. Representation has been made to one of the foundations for assistance with respect to these respirations and we hope to get assistance with more respirators. However we do not have immediate need for more than the four we have at present. If we have the need for more and if it is necessary for us to order more, we will.

In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, up to last Tuesday the official number of cases confirmed was 53.

The question that Head 39 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

CONCLUSION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be a matter of interest to hon. members to know that for today so far we have dealt with and passed a total of twelve Resolutions and Bills which I think if it is not a record it is almost a record of business done by this Chamber during the course of the day.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in view of that, I think hon. members have now earned a respite and that brings Government Business at an end for today.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House be adjourned until next Tuesday, 25th June, 1963 at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I want to remind the Hon. Leader of the House that

we said on the last occasion that we were adjourning until today to deal with matters on the Order Paper, but that we will deal with the question of Federation next Tuesday and that the debate according to you will be broadcasted again.

You may remember, Sir, that I moved the adjournment which was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the debate be further postponed, therefore, I expect the Hon. Leader of the House to live up to that pledge and that he will deal with this Resolution first.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, what was said was that I was dealing with it next Tuesday but I made no reference that it would be the first thing on the Order Paper. (VOICES: Yes.)

Normally, I think the best time would be half past four o'clock. Of course, it does not matter to me one way or the other.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is a question of the Rediffusion service.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think Your Honour will issue the necessary instructions to have the Rediffusion speakers here. I think the time should be half past four o'clock. I propose that we meet at 12 o'clock (noon) and continue with Government Business until 2 p.m. and from half past two we continue with Private Members Business until the expiration of Private Members Business at 4.30 o'clock. After that, we start the Federation debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: First of all, I would like to remind the Hon. Minister that what time we begin does not affect me at all because I have already spoke. When we met on Tuesday last the Government brought in a motion to initiate this debate over a statement raised by the Hon. Premier and when we adjourned the Hon. Leader of the House asked that we meet today so as to assist in clearing off its other business on the Order Paper and that we revert to the Federation debate on the following Tuesday which was to be the first Order of Government Business of that day.
7.25 p.m.

We said we will postpone the Federation debate today and then on the following Tuesday we will revert to it. We were given the impression that we wanted to use today for a particular purpose. Furthermore, we agreed to give up the time for Private Members' Business so that the Government would have all the time for Government Business.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is quite correct but in his inference he is putting in more than what I intended. I said that we would revert to the Federation debate on Tuesday.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I personally have no objection to beginning the Federation debate at 12 o'clock noon; if it is the consensus of opinion that we want the Federation debate begun at 12 o'clock noon, if that is so, it is O.K. with me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has agreed that if hon. members want it, the Federation debate will be started on Tuesday. It is now left for me to put the question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon. Before I adjourn the House, let me remind hon. members that when they are aware of what is taking place in this Chamber, do not let them be deluded by wrong information as it was given only today over Rediffusion Service as to the purpose of this meeting. If they were to take them seriously, it means that officers of this House are going to be worried by telephone enquiries as to whether it is true that this House will be meeting today. I have received at least two queries as to what change has been made. No change could be made after the adjournment has been moved and agreed to. Let hon. members rest assured that the decision which is made on the adjournment of the House will remain the decision of the House.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 25th June, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.55 p.m.